THE

AMERICAN AND FOREIGN

# CHRISTIAN UNION.

VOL. V. FEBRUARY, 1854. No. 2.

## THE CONTENTS OF THE PRESENT NUMBER.

We endeavor to make every number of our Magazine interesting and instructive; but we think that the present will be found to be more so than ordinary. The letters from France, Piedmont, and other parts of our field are highly important. And so, too, are several of the articles of a general nature which we give on this occasion, such as those relating to *Liberty of Conscience*, *Roman Catholic Prayer-Meetings*, *Lectures to Romanists and Protestants*, etc.

The Board have recently voted $400 to the Evangelical Society of Belgium, $1000 to the Evangelical Society of Geneva, $1000 to the Waldensian Table, (for missions in Sardinia, of which Dr. Revel gives such an interesting account in his letter,) and $1000 to the Central Protestant Society of France, in addition to their usual grant to the Evangelical Society of Paris, for the support of fifteen missionaries. These grants show that the Board are enlarging their operations abroad, so far as the continent of Europe is concerned. They desire greatly to extend them in Ireland, Canada, and South America. They will certainly do so, if our friends and patrons will liberally and promptly give their support. Now is the time when their aid is greatly needed. We are in the midst of the winter, when the work, especially that of visiting from house to house, and reading and distributing the Sacred Scriptures, can be done with best advantage in many of the fields of our labor.

## OUR PLATE, AND THE ORDER OF BENEDICTINES.

The Benedictines were the most ancient of all the Orders of the Roman Catholic Church. Their founder was St. Benedict of Norcia,

(a town in the States of the Church, some forty miles from Rome,) who was born in the year of our Lord, 480. This remarkable man, founded a monastery on Monte Cassino, in the neighborhood of Naples, and drew up a code of rules for its inmates. These rules were extensively adopted by the monasteries founded in Western Europe, for more than six hundred years. In process of time there were more than a dozen branches of the Benedictine Order, some of which became very celebrated, such as the Clugniacs, (from Clugny in Burgundy, France,) the Carthusians, the Cœlestines, the Cistercians, Bernardines, the Trappists,* etc. etc. In the 12th and 13th centuries arose the Orders of the Augustinians, the Carmelites, the Dominicans, and the Franciscans, and their many branches. And in the 16th century arose the last, most effective, and most dangerous of all the six great Orders, THE JESUITS! This powerful and unscrupulous Order was organized to meet and withstand the Reformation, and most dreadful has been the collision during three centuries.

Of all the Orders, the Benedictines have been, on the whole, the most useful and the most respected. In England they were called the *Black Friars*, from the color of their dress. They were the friends of knowledge, and cultivated literature to a far greater extent than most of the other Orders. Some of their monasteries, among which we may mention those of Monte Cassino, Monte Virgine, Valladolid, Montserrat, Fulda, Clugny and Moelk, became very celebrated. Among the learned men who belonged to their order we may name Alcuin (the founder of the University of Paris,) Anselm and the Venerable Bede. Augustin, who came to England in 596 to convert the heathen Saxons, and became the first Archbishop of Canterbury, was a Benedictine. Some of the "fathers" of this Order rendered most important service to the cause of letters in the middle ages, and in those immediately subsequent to the invention of the Art of Printing. The "Benedictine edition of the Fathers of the Christian Church" is still greatly esteemed, and in great demand.

It is matter of record that the Benedictine Fathers lived well, at least in many of the great monasteries. One would certainly infer as much from the appearance of things as indicated by the Plate

* There was a branch of the Benedictines in France that derived their name from the Valley of Fontevraud (in Poitou,) in which it took its rise. In this branch the *nuns* were the superiors, and the *monks* subject to them! This branch had fifty-seven monasteries in France, which were all suppressed in the Revolution of 1789.

which is given in this number—particularly during the season of Carnival. But "good living," in the sense of having a plenty of good things to eat and drink, was far from being confined to the "fathers" of the Benedictine Order. There are occasions when the Romish priests and nuns, even in our own country, do not disdain "good cheer," and actually give way, even on very sacred occasions (such as the consecration of a church, the reception of the veil, etc.) to enormous festivities.

Pope John XXII., who died in 1334, found, after exact inquiry, that since the rise of this Order, it had produced twenty-four popes, near two hundred cardinals, seven thousand archbishops, fifteen thousand bishops, fifteen thousand abbots, above four thousand saints, and had held upwards of thirty-seven thousand monasteries; and that as many as twenty emperors and ten empresses, forty-seven kings, fifty queens, twenty sons of emperors, forty-eight sons of kings, more than one hundred princesses, (daughters of emperors and kings,) besides dukes, marquises, earls, countesses innumerable had belonged to this Order.

## ROMAN CATHOLIC PRAYERS FOR THE CONVERSION OF PROTESTANT COUNTRIES.

There is scarcely anything in the doings of Rome in these days which have more interested us than her Prayers for the Conversion of Protestant Nations. Many of our readers have doubtless read of the efforts of Father Ignatius, (the Rev. Mr. Spencer, a convert from English Puseyism to Romanism,) who has for many years been stirring up the Roman Catholics of Ireland, and those of France, and other countries on the continent, to offer up special prayer for the conversion of England to the Faith of Rome. The amiable and benevolent spirit of this scion of a noble English House has greatly interested all who have ever made his acquaintance. With great zeal and perseverance, united to great simplicity and meekness of manners, this remarkable man, now no longer young, still pursues this one great object of his life—that of securing the recovery of his native land from the Reformed to the Romish Doctrine. With him, *prayer* seems to be everything. The earnestness of discussion, and the strife of polemics, he leaves to Wiseman, and Newman, and John of Tuam, and such like Champions of Rome, and calls upon all who

will listen to his voice, to retire with him to the solitude of the closet, the cloister, and the sanctuary, and pray to God, or rather to the "Mother of God" (as Rome impiously styles the blessed mother of our Lord) and the Saints, for the Conversion of Old England. This one great subject presses day and night on his heart. For this he journeys and watches, and exhorts and prays—year after year. It is impossible not to respect such feelings and such a character, however much we may be convinced that erroneous views and motives have shed a disastrous influence on both.

But the man who has done most to institute and organize prayer, if we may be allowed the expression, among the Roman Catholics for the conversion of Protestant and other heretical countries to the Romish Faith, is the venerable Curate of the Church of St. Eustache, in the city of Paris. This remarkable man has actually founded an *Association for Prayer*, which ramifies over all France, and embraces many hundreds of thousands of people. Even so long as ten years ago, the members of this Association exceeded a million! Like Father Matthew, he furnishes a small medal to every member. The terms of membership are very simple. All that is required is to engage in a solemn manner to repeat one or more *Pater Nosters* (the Lord's Prayer) and the *Ave Maria*, (or Hail, Mary,) every day, with the *intention* that these prayers shall stand, in Heaven's account, in favor of the extension of Rome's dominion! If parents find that it is at any time irksome or inconvenient to offer up these prayers, they can engage their children to say them, and this will have the desired efficacy!

A few years ago, when in Paris, we went one Sabbath night to the Church of St. Eustache to hear the worthy old curate preach, and to be a witness of the service of prayer which every Sabbath night follows the sermon. On that occasion the sermon was on Repentance as a preparation for Easter, which was near at hand. The discourse contained many good things—such as no evangelical Protestant could object to. Towards its close, however, the doctrine of Penance was dragged in, as usual with Roman Catholic preachers, to the great detriment of the Truth contained in the other parts.

The sermon being finished, the benevolent old preacher gave notice to the congregation that there would be a season of prayer, after an interval of a few minutes granted for the purpose of allowing those to retire who were unwilling or unable to remain longer.

After all was quiet, he arose in the pulpit and stated to the five or six hundred people who staid, the subjects of prayer for the occasion.

And first of all, he said that he desired their prayers for five or six hundred young people of the Parish (which embraces some 36,000 inhabitants!) who, he said, were very giddy and thoughtless. "It is true," said he, "that they do not ask your prayers, poor things, but nevertheless they greatly need them." In the next place, he requested their prayers in behalf of a young man who was present, that had been very profligate, but now desired to abandon his sinful ways. He read a portion of a letter which he had received from this young man, which was certainly a singular rhapsody, but contained here and there some ideas which showed a desire for instruction in regard to religious things. And then the venerable Curate asked the prayers of the congregation for eighty poor people, and forty-three sick persons of the parish—some of them near unto death. He also asked their prayers for twenty-three Protestants and seventeen Jews. After that he went on to ask their prayers for Spain, poor, distracted Spain,—formerly at the head of the Catholic world, but now in a sad and almost ruined condition. "We are called on," said he, "by the Encyclical letter of his Holiness, the Pope, to pray for Spain." "And finally," he added, "do not forget England and Russia." I expected that he would bring in the United States, but he did not that night. The Sabbath evening previous, he spoke at some length about *England*, and said that he had good news to tell of that country—namely, "that twenty-two ministers of the Anglican, or Established Church, had their faces turned Romeward."

After having announced these general subjects of prayer, he descended from the pulpit, repaired to the altar, went through the service of the mass, and then kneeled down before the altar, and remained in that position about twenty minutes, engaged no doubt in prayer; the congregation, in the meanwhile stood up, and, following the Choir, chaunted the Psalms for the Evening Service. At the close, the people quietly retired; and this was a Roman Catholic Prayer-meeting. Although I could not but respect the feelings and apparent devoutness of the congregation, among whom were many who were evidently of the middle class of Society, I was certainly astonished at this mode of praying for definite and important objects. And yet this is Rome's way of engaging the prayers of her children in behalf of what she deems desirable. It is to repeat the *Pater Nos-*

*ter* and *Ave Maria*, or other general prayers, *in reference to the objects in question*,—that is with the *intent* that those objects are to receive the efficacy of the prayers offered upon the occasion! How different from an intelligent and earnest pleading for the objects of prayer, which any well-instructed Protestant considers to be necessary to that solemn and important exercise. And yet this is of a piece with the whole system of Romanism. It is essentially a *Religion of form*. And how can we know this fact without feeling a lively desire to see its votaries become acquainted with the simple, and beautiful, and reasonable religion of the Gospel? An intimate knowledge of the observances which Romanists have of everything that constitutes true Christianity would lead us to pity them, and to pray and labor earnestly for their enlightenment and salvation.

Just such prayers as we have described are now offering up, at the recommendation of the Head of the Church, by the Romanists of our country for its conversion to the Romish Faith. Such prayer-meetings as that which we have spoken of are now held in many places in our land by the more devout "Faithful," that this land may be made a Roman Catholic country, and blest with the superstitions, and errors, and priestcraft of the Church of Rome. Reader! think of this.

## MR. LEO'S COURSE OF LECTURES AT NEWARK, N. J.

In our last number we mentioned that a course of lectures on some of the prominent doctrines of Romanism was in process of delivery in Newark, (N. J.) by the Rev. Patrick J. Leo, and stated that, although there were some manifestations of a determination among a portion of the Roman Catholic population of that city to make disturbance, yet, owing to the firmness of the Mayor, there was no serious interruption attempted after the first evening.

The subjects, which Mr. Leo discussed with much ability, and in a very interesting and attractive manner, were: The Doctrine of Confession, Transubstantiation, the Invocation of the Saints, etc.

The hall was filled every night by a most attentive audience, among whom were not a few Romanists, who heard many truths which must have been new to most of them. We cannot but hope that much good will result from these lectures—so Christian and faithful in their spirit, and so totally different from those of some of the self-appointed lecturers who have traversed the country for the

last several years, abusing Roman Catholics, and wounding their feelings, as well as attacking the errors of their church in a rude and unnecessarily harsh and offensive manner. Mr. Leo's great object is to enlighten and save,—not to abuse and ridicule.

After the series of lectures was terminated, Mr. Leo delivered, at the request of many of those who had heard the Course, another lecture, at which something like $100 were raised towards the defrayment of the expenses of the hall, light, attendance, etc., for the previous lectures. We subjoin the very just and appropriate notice of that lecture and of the subsequent proceedings, which appeared the day following (Dec. 21) in the *Newark Daily Advertiser:*

"Rev. Mr. Leo delivered a closing lecture last evening at Washington Hall, to a large audience. He began by saying there was as much perhaps to admire in the past history as in the present greatness of this Republic. For ages had America, like a rich jewel, lain hidden in the hand of God, and when in the fullness of time He opened it to mankind's admiring gaze, it flashed before them with a brilliancy and a beauty entirely its own.

"He gave a brief sketch of the state of things in Europe, particularly in England after the Reformation, and prior to the departure of the Pilgrims for America. He asked, What was the object of their coming to these shores? and showed that it was to enjoy the privileges of civil and religious liberty.

"Now, if there is in our midst a power which is silently seeking to sap the foundation of this liberty, how ought every true American to endeavor to counteract it? Yesterday this country opened its arms to receive this power; to-day it aims a deadly sting at the country's bosom. Yesterday its representatives were a few squalid wretches; to-day it sends its mitred prelates in royal pomp through this republic. It acknowledges allegiance to a foreign prince, and by its will takes its shape and direction. It aims to bring this country under its yoke. It consigns to hopeless perdition all who refuse to yield obedience to it, and stamps its every act with the seal of a pretended infallibility—I speak of Romanism.

"Between Romanism and Republicanism there is, and will be, opposition. And this opposition arises not from any outward circumstances or incidental relations of the two, but from their very nature and essential elements. In design, in interest, in constitution, they are both unlike and irreconcilable.

"It is true that Romanism may exist in a republic, but it will be as the serpent was in the garden of Eden—not to remain satisfied with the happiness there afforded, but seeking to carry out its own treacherous designs.

"In proportion to the power of Romanism in a Republic, will be the decline of that republic. Romanism will demand what Republicanism will find it inconsistent to allow. Republicanism seeks to make the people the

great governing power; Romanism seeks always to keep the people in subjection—to make the people as nothing. In its very constitution it is monarchical. Its head, the Pope, is a temporal Prince; his officers of State, the Cardinals; beneath them, the Archbishops; lower still, the Bishops; after them Vicar Generals; their subalterns are the priests, and underneath the priests, underneath all are the people.

"American Republicanism repudiates the idea of all connection between Church and State. Romanism, on the contrary, seeks not only to establish this connection, but holds that the Church must be above the State and govern it. In proof of this he quoted from the Encyclical letter of the late Pope Gregory XVI. Between Republicanism and Romanism there can be no agreement, because of the *persecuting spirit* of the latter. Rome will suffer no religion but her own unscriptural one to exist where she has absolute control.

"In proof of this, the lecturer quoted the standard authorities of that Church—1st, The Bishop's oath; 2d, The teachings of three of Rome's most learned and reliable Doctors of Divinity, on the subject of the persecution of heretics. These are, Thomas Aquinas, Cardinal Bellarmine, and Dr. Dens. 3d, He brought forward the decisions of the General Councils which sanction the persecution of heretics; and the teachings found in the notes in the Rhemish New Testament.

"Having established the opposition of Roman Catholicism to Republicanism, by several additional proofs, the lecturer proceeded to draw a distinction between Romanism, *as a system*, and the Roman Catholics as individuals. 'Let no man,' said Mr. Leo, 'imagine that I desire to impute to Roman Catholic men, indiscriminately, the abominations of the Papal System. On the contrary, I respect and highly esteem many individuals of that Church, and shall ever urge the duty of cherishing towards them the feelings of kindness and charity.' He paid them a handsome compliment for their many excellent traits of character, and deplored the ignorance in which the masses of them were kept, of the nature and designs of their own Church by the hierarchy.

"He closed with an eloquent appeal to the audience to guard the interests of the Republic against the coil of the Papacy, and reminded them of the declaration of Lafayette to President Adams, that, 'If the liberties of this country are ever destroyed, it will be by the hands of Jesuits.' The lecture was marked by great ability, and was received with high satisfaction.

"At the close, the audience unanimously adopted the following resolutions:

"*Resolved*, That the thanks of this meeting be tendered to Mr. Leo for the able exposition he has given of the nature and workings of the Papal

system—the vast importance to the American people of diligently guarding against its encroachments—and for the happy manner in which he has executed the work in the 'course of the lectures' now brought to a close.

"—That in the judgment of this meeting, the lectures of Mr. Leo have been of great use in removing ignorance, in subduing prejudice, and in strengthening the faith of the people in the principles of evangelical religion—and also in exciting in their hearts a deep sense of the value of civil and religious liberty, and of the importance of maintaining these invaluable rights and privileges, at every possible hazard.

"—That the thanks of this community are due to the officers of the American and Foreign Christian Union Society, for the course of lectures delivered here by Mr. Leo, under their patronage—and for the unwearied and well-directed efforts in spreading the pure Gospel of our Redeemer among the Roman Catholic population of our land and the world—and we pledge to them anew our sympathies, our prayers, and our cheerful co-operation."

It is probable that the Board will prosecute this mode of diffusing light and of doing good to both Protestants and Romanists, by public Lectures, quite extensively, as soon as they can organize a corps of well-qualified and effective lecturers.

## LIBERTY OF CONSCIENCE.

(For the American and Foreign Christian Union.)

As every man must give an account of himself to God, and no one can answer for him; (for God has proclaimed that *every one must answer* for himself, and "every one must bear his own burden,") then, it is every one's duty to examine and think, decide and act, *for himself.*

If he permit another to do so for him, and thus be led into error, it is at his own risk. He must still answer to God for himself, and for this neglect to exercise the judgment which God has given him.

But for this purpose, *he must be free* to . . . . . *inquire and decide;* and *God* having made and left him so, *man* can have no right to force him. For, if he has such a right, then (according to what party has the power for the time,) they may compel him to become an *Atheist* or *Infidel, Mohammedan* or *Hindoo, Jew* or *Christian, Protestant* or *Romanist,* at their pleasure. But this would be absurd, confounding truth and error, destroying man's free agency, and *overturning the moral Government of God,* with all his purposes of mercy.

Indeed, God has so formed the mind or soul of man FREE, that no one *can* make another believe what he does not think to be true. He may perhaps force him to *pretend* belief, and become a hypocrite, but not a real believer.

How wicked, then, to persecute, or by punishment and threats, attempt to *compel* men to believe what they think untrue! Again, God has given to man A CONSCIENCE, which must be unfettered, or it can be of no use. But being thus *free*, every one is bound to examine and inquire, in order to inform and enlighten his conscience, or he is responsible for the neglect. He must seek, carefully and earnestly, with prayer to God for guidance, (James i. 5.) to find out the truth, and having found it, he must follow it, according to the dictates of his conscience.

God alone, our maker, is *Lord of the conscience*, and has the right to prescribe rules and instructions for its guidance. This he has done in his Holy Word, for the direction of every one, unto the truth.

Listen, then, *every one*, to God's declaration of Liberty of Conscience, freedom of thought, and of choice.

These he has proclaimed:

I. By declaring that every man is responsible, and must *answer for himself;* thus implying that he is a *free agent.*

II. By calling on every one to *examine and judge* for himself; thus implying the right and liberty to do so.

III. By declaring and holding up *His Holy Scriptures*, as our rule and guide, and commanding us to *search* and *follow them;* thus implying our right and duty to read, examine, and judge for ourselves.

IV. By declaring that *every man* is a *sinner*, and therefore needs, for himself, an atoning *Saviour*, and telling every one to *seek* this salvation.

V. By proclaiming this joyful news, that God himself, has provided this ransom and atonement, and offers it to every man, as a free gift, *on condition* of faith and repentance; implying that we may not, and do not, turn to Him, *unless we choose.*

VI. By declaring that He will help us, by his Blessed Spirit, to repent, believe and pray; will purify and fit us for heaven: and that, if after all these offers of mercy and grace, we finally perish, it is because *we would not* accept them.

God thus speaks *directly* to *every man individually*, telling him of his ruined condition, and the way of escape, nay, loudly calling to him, to "flee from the wrath to come." Matt. iii. 7, Rom. v. 9. Every sinner may, therefore, and if he will be saved, *must*, for *himself*, come to Christ, and believing, shall receive all these blessings. See Matt. xi. 28. John v. 40. Rev. xxii. 17.

Who then shall dare to come between the sinner and his God, or intercept this free forgiveness offered to him?

But let us listen, with reverence and attention, to some of God's declarations, (out of many,) contained in his holy word, in fuller proof of what we have stated, and in the same order.

I. *That every man must answer for himself.* "Every one of us shall give account of himself to God." Rom. xiv. 12.

"We must all stand before the Judgment seat of Christ; that every one may receive, according to that he hath done, whether good or bad." 2 Cor. v. 10.

"Every man must bear his own burden." Gal. vi. 5. "God will render to every man according to his deeds, &c." Rom. ii. 6.

"The wicked shall go away into everlasting punishment," "but the righteous into life eternal." Matt. xxv. 46.

(See also 1st Peter, iv. 18. Phil. ii. 12. Act iii. 19, &c.)

II. Every one is called on to *examine and judge* for himself.

"Examine yourselves whether ye be in the faith." 2 Cor. xiii. 5.

"Prove all things, hold fast that which is good." 1 Thess. v. 21.

"Let every one be fully persuaded in his own mind." Rom. xiv. 5.

"I speak as unto wise men, judge ye what I say." 1 Cor. x. 15.

"Believe not every spirit, but try the spirits, whether they are of God, &c." 1 John iv.

"I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing, therefore choose life, &c." Deut. xxx. 19.

(See also 2 Peter i. 10. John v. 39. Acts xvii. 11, &c.)

III. "The *Holy Scriptures* are our rule and guide, and *we must search* and *examine them.*"

"Search the Scriptures." John v. 39.

"To the Law and to the Testimony, if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." Isaiah viii. 20.

"All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable, &c." and "these scriptures are able to make thee wise unto salvation, through faith in Jesus Christ." 2 Tim. iii. 15, 16.

"These were more noble," "in that they searched the scriptures daily." Acts xvii. 11.

"Whatsoever things were written aforetime, were written for our learning." Rom. xv. 4.

"Desire ye the sincere milk of the word, that ye may grow thereby." 1 Peter ii. 2.

"Thy word is a light unto my feet, and a lamp unto my path." Psalm cxix. cv. xcix. &c.

(See also John xx. 31. 2 Peter i. 19. Plasm xix. 7, &c.)

IV. Every one is a *sinner*, and needs and must seek for himself *a Saviour.* (See John iii. 3. Isaiah lv. 6.)

"There is no man that liveth, and sinneth not." 2 Chron. vi. 36.

"If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves." 1 John i. 8.

"In many things we offend all." James iii. 2.

"I tell you, nay, but except ye repent ye shall all, likewise, perish." Luke xiii. 3.

"Whoso hath not the son of God hath not life, but the wrath of God abideth on him." John iii. 36.

"Jews and Gentiles, they are all under sin." Rom. iii. 9. "And so death passed on all men, for all have sinned." Rom. iii. 9.

Indeed the great object of the Bible is to show men that they are sinners, and to proclaim a saviour.

V. God himself has provided a *ransom*, and offers it, freely, to all who will accept it, through faith in Christ.

"Save from going down to the pit, I have found a ransom." Job xxxiii. 24.

"God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." John iii. 16.

"By grace are ye saved, through faith; and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God: not of works." Eph. ii. 8, 9.

"Therefore, being justified by faith, we have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ." Rom. v. 1, 8, 9, 10.

"Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved." Acts, 16, 31.

"He that believeth in the son of God hath life." John 3, 36.

"And the Spirit and the Bride say come;" "and whosoever will, let him come, and take of the water of life freely." Rev. xxii. 17.

(See also Matt. xi. 28; John vi. 37; Titus iii. 4–7, and i. 13; 1 Peter ii. 24, &c.)

VI. God promises the aid of the blessed Spirit, and if we perish, it is *because we will not come.*

"I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh." Joel ii. 28; Acts 27.

"How much more shall your Heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him." Luke xx. 13.

"The Spirit also helpeth our infirmities, for we know not what we should pray for, as we ought; but the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us," &c. Rom. viii. 26, 27.

"Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling, for it is God that worketh in you to will and to do of his good pleasure." Phil. ii. 12, 13.

"*Ye will not come* unto me, that ye might have life." John v. 40.

"O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, how often would I have gathered your children together, *and ye would not.*" Luke xiii. 34.

"And *grieve not* the Holy Spirit of God." Eph. iv. 30.

"Ye stiff-necked, ye do always *resist the Holy Ghost.*" Acts vii. 51.

(See also Matth. vii. 7, xxii. 3–4; Heb. ii. 3; Luke xiv. 7–18, &c. &c.)

---

While God is thus proclaiming Himself, "The Lord God merciful and gracious," "not willing that any should perish," inviting all to come and receive free forgiveness; as weeping over obstinate rebellious sinners, "Oh that thou hadst known the things that belong to thy peace." Luke xix. 41–42; declaring "There is joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth;" yet warning the rebellious and obstinate, "How shall ye escape," "Where shall the ungodly and the sinner appear." 1 Pet. iv. 18. While God is thus speaking *directly to every one's* conscience, warning, entreating, pleading and promising, *yet leaving him free;* shall any Church thrust herself between the sinner and his God, forbidding him to hear, to think, or to believe for himself? And thus intercepting these rich offers of a free salvation, and withholding entirely, or selling out, these heavenly blessings at her pleasure.

We would hold it a daring and blasphemous usurpation. The Church has got no such power. On the contrary, her commission is, simply, "Go ye into all the world, and *preach the Gospel* to every creature," Mark xvi. 15; that is, proclaim the glad news of God's free salvation, and invite all to come and partake of it. Rev. xxii. 17.

The Church has no right to force the conscience, dictate to, or coerce any one. She cannot answer to God for him, because God has declared *that every one must answer for himself.* Indeed, the Church is but the aggregate of the individual members composing it, each of whom must give an account to God for himself.

The Church does not consist of the Bishops and Priests only, (as some usurpingly pretend,) but is "the assembly of all the faithful Christian people," including the Bishops and Priests. Hear St. Paul: "To the Church of God, which is at Corinth, to them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus, called saints." 1 Cor. i. 2. "To all the saints in Christ Jesus which are at Philippi, with the Bishops and Deacons." Phil. i. 1. "At Miletus he sent to Ephesus, and called the elders of the Church." Acts xx. 17. The Clergy, then, *are not the Church.* Neither must they "be *lords* over God's heritage." 1 Pet. v. 3.

A Church may declare who are its members; and for heresy, or for scandalous conduct, may reject a member, and declare him to be no longer such. But here, *their power over him ceases.* They have no right to persecute

or force the conscience. "A man that is an heretic, after the first and second admonition reject." Titus, iii. 10. "But if he neglect to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man or a publican." Matt. xviii. 17. Their power simply extends by discipline, to place a heretic or offender out of the pale of the Church—as if now a heathen, over whom they have no power or responsibility.

If the Church pass any resolutions for order and government, or defining the faith of the body, every member, so far from being bound, *implicitly* to obey them, ought to examine if they agree with the word of God; *and if they contradict it*, he is bound to *disobey* them; and, if necessary, come out of that Church, else it would result, that every member must follow his Church, however she may apostatize, or corrupt the faith, as many Churches have done.

What says God of the apostate Church of the Book of Revelation? "Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins." Ch. xvii. 4. And the Apostles refused to obey the rulers of the Jewish Church, (of which they were formerly members,) saying, "We ought to obey God rather than men," Acts, v. 29, implying *the right and duty of private judgment, to examine and decide what human laws contradict God's.*

Shall any Bishops and Priests, then, ever impiously dare to call themselves the Church, and say to every one, "You must believe as we tell you." You must not examine or think for yourselves? Shall they dare to prohibit the reading of the Bible? (God's charter of freedom and testament of love to man)—dare to imprison, or make galley-slaves, or banish those who read this gospel of our salvation, as is now done at Florence?—dare to burn tens of thousands, as heretics, as the Inquisition has done?—or exterminate, by fire and sword, hundreds of thousands of pious and faithful Christians, like the Waldenses, the Albigenses, and many others in every land?

Is this the Spirit of Christ? who charged his disciples, "Behold, I send you forth as sheep in the midst of wolves. Be ye, therefore, wise as serpents and *harmless as doves*" Matth. x. 16.—who said, "Love your enemies, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them who persecute you and despitefully use you"—who, when John and James proposed to call down fire from heaven on the opposing Samaritans, replied, "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of; *for the Son of Man came not to destroy men's lives, but to save them.*" Luke, ix. 55, 56. When the zealous servants proposed to root out the tares, "*Nay*," said our Lord, "let both grow together until the harvest." Matth. xiii. 29.

The blessed Jesus said, "My kingdom is not of this world;" and though he had all power in heaven and in earth, Matt. xxviii. 18, yet *he compelled no one.* He might, by his Almighty power, have forced, or punished the unbelieving Jews; but instead of this, he *wept over them* Luke, xiii. 34.

He prayed for them, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do."

Hear St. Paul teaching clergymen their duty. 2 Tim. ii. 24. "And the servant of the Lord must not strive, but *be gentle unto all*, apt to teach, patient: in meekness instructing those that oppose themselves; if *God*, peradventure, *will give them repentance*, to the acknowledgment of the truth." "Remember, that I ceased not to warn every one, night and day, with tears." Acts, xxi. 31.

Who are they that, instead of being wise, and gentle as sheep among wolves, have become wolves, and devoured the sheep? Not shepherds sent by Christ—not true pastors of *His* Church.

Mahomet, indeed, propagated his religion by the sword,—a very different religion from that of the Prince of Peace, and an imposture; yet even Mahomet did not force the conscience. His rule was, "Ye know your terms, ye Christian dogs: the Koran, the tribute, or the sword." But now, even Mahommedans have granted full liberty of conscience and of worship to every denomination of Christians.

What shall we say, then, of that enslaving system which claims power and supremacy over the conscience—over all people and kingdoms? Of that Church which, by her ambitious and cruel leaders, decreed the extermination of all heretics (that is, opposers of her usurping sway,) by confiscation, imprisonment, exile and death, as in her Councils of 4th Lateran and Constance,) which absolved from the obligation of oaths, (that is, authorizes and approves perjury,) decrees that no faith need be kept with heretics; whose Bishops swear to persecute them to the utmost of their power; who, to this day, where she dares, will permit no free inquiry, no reading of God's word, no liberty of conscience and of worship; but denounces the *freedom of the press and the right of private judgment*, as "never to be sufficiently execrated;" who has by herself, or by urging others, put to death, by torture, the sword, or the stake, by massacre or crusade, hundreds of thousands of faithful christians; and even now, by her inquisition, tortures, imprisons and persecutes all who dare to think for themselves; who, keeping out of sight God's free salvation, (offered to all without money and without price;) commands all to come and *buy forgiveness from her*—absolutions, masses, extreme unctions, indulgences, and deliverance from purgatory: thus enriching her ambitious heads, while, alas, enslaving the people, corrupting the faith, and ruining poor souls.

Can this be a Church of Christ, which thus enslaves the souls and bodies of her people? (Oh that they would but examine for themselves, and assert their freedom!) Is it not rather that great Apostacy which St. John, with wonder, saw arising on the seven-hilled city (Rome) [Rev. xvii. &c.] and St. Paul predicted to arise, and exalt itself above all that is called God,

2 Thes. ch. ii. and against which so many woes are denounced in the Revelations, chap. xviii. &c.

Oh, fellow-sinner! of whatever denomination, let no man or Church deceive us by pretended power over our consciences; but let us, as St. Paul tells us, "examine ourselves whether we be in the faith," and proving all things, hold fast that which is good; for we must each answer for himself to God. We are children of the same Father in Heaven. Let there be no persecution or bitter hatred among us, but let us seek to aid and to enlighten one another, to obtain the same free salvation, and the same Heaven, loving one another, as St. John tells us. 1 John, iv. 10–11. Let us love heretics, and even our enemies, as our Saviour bids us, Matth. v. 44, and instead of persecuting, pray for them, if *perhaps God will give them repentance*, to the acknowledgment of the truth; for this repentance and true faith are God's province, not man's. Acts, v. 31. Prayer, not persecution, is ours.

---

"The *Gift of God* is eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord." Rom. vi. 23. Let each of us, therefore, earnestly seek and obtain, *for himself*, an interest in this great salvation, 2 Pet. i. 10: Matt. vii. 7, that "being justified by faith, we may have peace with God," Rom. v. 1, and *then* we may exclaim, with David, "The LORD is on my side, I will not fear what MAN can do unto me." Psalms cxviii. 6 and 14.

## THE WALDENSIAN CHURCH AT TURIN.

The dedication of the new Church at Turin, built for the Waldenses, and chiefly at the expense of British Christians, announced for the 20th of October last, was adjourned to December, on account of the impossibility of having the interior completed at an earlier day, owing to a severe domestic calamity which befel the architect. This Church is an imposing edifice, in the southern part of the city, and arrests the attention of the stranger on his arrival at the terminus of the Turin and Genoa railway. It will contain more than a thousand persons, and in style and appearance is worthy of the position it holds as the *first Italian Evangelical Church*, and built in the Capital of North-Western Italy. Although so large, it will soon be found too small; so mightily is the Word of God making progress in Piedmont.

It is difficult to overrate the importance of the city of Turin, with its 160,000 inhabitants. The admirable railway between it and

Genoa was completed in December last. It is one of the best constructed roads in Europe, and the part which runs through the Apennines, in the neighborhood of Genoa, is a splendid triumph over the greatest obstacles. By this railway Turin is brought within six hours of one of the finest seaports of Italy, from which lines of steamers are soon to commence running to New-York and Rio de Janeiro.

"No country on the Continent (says the *Home and Foreign Record* of the Free Church of Scotland, for December last) presents such an open door, and so great encouragement for evangelistic effort, as Piedmont at the present time; and there is no channel through which the cause can be more effectually promoted, and with greater confidence, than the Waldensian Church."

It will be remembered by many of our readers, that the Rev. Dr. Revel was unable to remain in this country beyond the 9th of July, on his recent visit, because it was necessary that, as Moderator of the Synod, he should be at home for the ordination of several candidates for the ministry, which was appointed for the month of August. On that occasion four young men were set apart for the work of the ministry. Among them was a Mr. Appia, a son of the pastor of the Evangelical French Chapel at Frankfort in Germany, who in 1824 visited Holland and Paris, and collected a large sum for the erection and support of the hospital at La Tour, the chief place of the Waldenses. Besides these four young men, Dr. Desanctis, formerly a professor of theology and curate of the Magdalene Church at Rome, also received ordination; not being willing to labor any longer as a Protestant minister with no other ordination than that which he received at the hands of the Romish Church fifteen or twenty years ago. Dr. Desanctis is a man of great eloquence, and attracted many to hear him at Turin, even in the incommodious hall in which he preached before the opening of the new Church, in which services in French and Italian are now held every Sabbath. At some future time we may give a notice of the life and conversion of this interesting man, whose writings on the Romish dogmas are so unanswerable and convincing.

### THE FESTIVAL AT BOBBIO, IN THE VALLEY OF LUCERNA.

On the 1st day of September last the valley of Lucerna was the scene of a great *Festa* of the Waldenses. It occurred at Bobbio, the chief village of the uppermost parish in that valley, of which the

Rev. Dr. Revel is the pastor. The services took place in the rear of the village, on the lower side of the mountain, amid the rocks, and beneath the chestnut trees. They lasted for several hours, with an interval of an hour or two, in which the people spread themselves about, beneath the trees, and partook of the refreshments which they had brought with them. We may add that, in the services of the afternoon, the people called on Dr. Revel to give some account of his visit to America—a request which he promised to comply with at length on a future occasion, the time not allowing more than a few words.

The first of September is celebrated in the history of the Waldenses "for the Glorious Return" of the "eight hundred" in 1689. It was resolved to have a commemoration of this memorable event on the very spot where, after three years' absence, the exiles re-entered their native valleys, and took the solemn oath, known by the name of the "Oath of Sibaud." Henri Arnaud, in that characteristic account inscribed to Queen Ann,—which elicited the inquiries of Napoleon addressed to the Waldensian deputation at Turin, in 1805—"La Glorieuse Rentrée des Vaudois,"—says of the events of that day, that after a beautiful sermon from Luke xvi. 16, preached by the minister mounted upon the door of a house placed upon the rocks, these gallant patriots took the oath of fidelity to each other, lifting up their right hand to heaven. By that oath they sware to "God, who had by his divine grace happily brought them back to the heritage of their fathers, to re-establish there the pure service of their holy religion, and engage to our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, as far as is possible for them, to pluck the rest of their brethren from the cruel Babylon, in order, with them, to restore and uphold his kingdom unto death."

From break of day the road to the village of Bobbio, which winds pleasantly upwards amid vineyards and chesnut plantations, was thronged with people from every Waldensian canton; and at ten o'clock more than two thousand were assembled in a natural amphitheatre surrounded by scenery not surpassed in wild grandeur anywhere in Europe. The Moderator, Dr. Revel, was called to preside, who commenced the proceedings by a fervent prayer. Then the *Te Deum* was sung, and the 54th chapter of Isaiah was read,—the words of which prophecy had been literally fulfilled in their case; and numerous stirring orations were delivered, recalling the events of their past history. Hymns composed for the occasion were sung, reviving the memory and rekindling the enthusiasm of ancient days; and the famous oath was read, by which, by solemn dedication, their fathers, though not more than eight hundred, had been strengthened to resist successfully the combined

armies of France and Savoy, consisting of twenty-two thousand men, and after eight months of miraculous preservation and success, to regain possession of their native valleys. The principal subject dwelt upon by the speakers, was the duty which devolves upon the Waldenses in these days, as the descendants of a nation of martyrs, to execute with far greater energy the mighty mission which seems intrusted to them by Providence, of being the restorers of the Gospel in Italy, their father-land. In the account of the proceedings given in the *Buona Novella*, we are informed that "the addresses after dinner, made almost all by peasants, bore chiefly upon the supreme importance of the Word of God being more known, appreciated, and attentively meditated upon by their people; that knowledge having been at once the strength and consolation of their fathers, as well as their glory in the present day. They were reminded of the ingenious saying of those Roman doctors who had come to convert them, that 'they had learned more of the Gospel in one day from the children of the Waldenses, than they had in a year spent on the benches of the universities.' They were reminded further how the first French translation of the Scriptures was owing to the Waldenses, who, in the depth of their poverty, and amid the fire, of the most sanguinary persecutions, headed the expense of translation and printing, by a contribution of not less than five hundred gold scudi: and there was specially and warmly pressed upon them, besides the public official worship, the great importance and beneficial influence upon families and upon the Church, of domestic religious services, and of *reunions* for the reading and study of the Bible." The assembly, after being again committed by prayer to the guardianship of God, dispersed by singing the doxology.

This celebration affords a new proof that there is yet one bright spot amidst the darkness of Italy. Of old, liberty and the Gospel found an asylum in the valleys; and their ancient insignia, which to this day emblazons the churches of the Waldenses, is still true: "Lux lucet in tenebris." Amidst the march of despotism and indifference to the true source of liberty, it is a great fact that the Waldenses feel the importance of reviving the spirit of their martyred forefathers, whose heroic deeds are known all over Christendom. They are setting us an example; and in this respect, as in many others, the kingdom of Sardinia is every day proving itself, as Lord Palmerston said more than two years ago, "a model worthy of imitation by all the nations of Europe."

---

## LETTER FROM LUCCA—MISS CUNNINGHAME.

An English gentleman who writes from Lucca, gives some interesting information respecting the effect of Miss Cunninghame's imprisonment. We make an extract or two from his letter.

"Meanwhile, the result of Miss Cunninghame's imprisonment appears to be really blessed already. People are more anxious than ever to get these mysterious 'tracts' which brought her into gaol, and to read that wonderful Bible which they are told, on the best authority, (that of the priests,) contains so many things against their Church. At first, too, the terms of Miss Cunninghame's release were her immediate withdrawal from Tuscany. Yet she is still here; and, if it were needful, others might come, too, and bring boxes of good tracts for the benighted Papists, who are truly thankful for them and read them with eagerness. In fact, we have arrived at such an unexpected state of circumstances, as to call upon us more urgently than ever for increased earnestness and more fervent prayer.

"The Bible is very largely read both here and in Florence, and more so every day. There is no necessity to conceal this general fact, for thousands know it; and it is only when details or names are made public that injury is done to the slow but steady progress of light in this country. An excellent standard work has been lately translated and published in Tuscany, in Italian, at a very low price. I doubt not that God will richly bless it to hundreds; and perhaps it will attract more attention, seeing it was written in prison."

It is a fact which ought to be well known, that if Miss Cunninghame had not been liberated from prison by the intervention of the Grand Duke of Tuscany, she would have been by the decision of the *Camera di Accusa*, the Court before which her case had come from the *first tribunal*. That Court had come to the decision that Miss C. had done nothing contrary to the laws of Tuscany—that to give the Bible to any one was not contrary to those laws; neither was it contrary to them to circulate tracts or books that contain no attacks on the Religion of the State, and that such was the character of the tracts which Miss C. had distributed.

## The Home Field.

The reports from our Missionaries in all parts of the country are encouraging. For the most part they are filled with details of visits made to Roman Catholic families, conversations held with them, readings and expositions of the Scriptures, prayers offered up, etc. etc. In this way our laborers are pursuing their important work. In other cases, they report, in addition to visits made, conversations held, Bibles and tracts distributed, etc., the sermons preached, the Bible classes and Sabbath schools superintended. In many ways, the "good seed of the Word" is scattered; but we are confident that

all the happy influences and results will only be known in eternity. We might give many details, if it were necessary, of a very cheering nature, but as we are going to give up an unusually large number of our pages this month to the foreign work of the Society, we must content ourselves with one or two cases.

One of our Missionaries visited one of the principal towns of New Jersey, not long since, and delivered several discourses on Romanism. One of the Romish priests of the place, a Pole, who had been in this country about eighteen months, and had ministered for some time to the hundreds of his countrymen in New-York and its vicinity, had the curiosity to go and hear him. Becoming interested in what he heard, he went a second time. Still more interested, he called several times on the Missionary and held many conversations with him on the great truths of the Gospel, as well as on the errors of the Church in which he had been born and educated. Our Missionary having completed his visit to that place, introduced the inquiring priest to some of the ministers of the Gospel there, by whom he has been instructed more perfectly in the way of Salvation. Of course this could not be done without attracting the notice of his Diocesan, Archbishop Hughes. In due time—nor was it a long time—he was deposed from the priesthood—a result which we are quite sure he will never have occasion to deplore, if he has come to the knowledge of the true Way of Life.

Driven from the priesthood in the place to which we have alluded, he came to New-York and called upon the officers of the American and Foreign Christian Union, who encouraged him to persevere in the new path on which he has entered. After a few weeks he returned to New Jersey, and has since endeavored to impart his convictions on the subject of Religion to his former co-religionists through the columns of a newspaper of that locality. May the Saviour lead him into the full knowledge of the Gospel and the experience of its blessed power in the heart, and make him a great blessing to his benighted countrymen and others in this land. All such persons should have the benefit of the earnest prayers of the friends of the Society, that they may be guided in the right way and made able, by Divine Grace, to stand against the temptations by which they may be assailed. Every such case should stimulate and encourage us in our attempts to impart the Gospel to the followers of the "Man of Sin," at home and abroad.

One of our Missionaries gives rather an amusing account of the dread which the Romanists of the place to which he was sent (a large town in Massachusetts) had of him at his appearance among them. At length they have become so convinced that he is not disposed to do them harm, that they bid him welcome to their humble habitations, and hear him speak of Jesus and Salvation with deep attention.

A Missionary in Pittsburgh, who certainly does not seem to have the fear of Rome before his eyes, writes to us thus: "The Papal Nuncio arrived here last Saturday night, accompanied by Bishop O'Connor and a staff of Popish priests. A demonstration on a grand scale was to be made on the Sabbath, but the well-timed and active exertions of Mayor Riddle completely frustrated their hopes. For that functionary addressed a note to Bishop O'Connor, forbidding any demonstration in the streets, and threatening to enforce the law against Sabbath profanation if they should attempt it. The Bishop was administering mass when he received the Mayor's note, and had to stop to answer it—for once submitting to the law. It was well for the Mayor that he was not in Tuscany. He deserves the good wishes and respect of the Protestant Churches throughout the land. O, that there were many like him, for then the 'Scarlet Lady' would not lift her head so high!"

## MR. LEO'S LECTURES AT NEWARK.

We have spoken elsewhere of Mr. Leo's Lectures at Newark, N. J. The following were the subjects:

1st. "The Growth and Decline of Popery in Ireland,"—which was the Introductory.

2d. "Auricular Confession."

3d. "Transubstantiation."

4th. "Invocation of the Saints."

5th. "Purgatory."

6th. "The Bible the only rule of Faith."

7th. "The Influence of Romanism on Civil and Religious Liberty."

The first and the last of these Lectures were addressed to Protestants; the others were addressed to the Romanists present, for whose benefit they were prepared and delivered. We have reasons for believing that these Lectures have made a good impression on Protestants as well as Romanists.

# Foreign Field.

## FRANCE.

We have received several important letters from France, which we subjoin in whole or in part. In the first place we call the attention of our readers to the following letter from the Evangelical Society of France, which treats of three topics of great importance. We are sure that no one can read it without being made to feel a deeper interest in the work which is going on in that country, and which, amid so many discouragements is still so prosperous. Surely our readers will offer up their prayers in behalf of that work and in behalf of the excellent brethren who are charged with the solemn task of directing it. Surely, too, they will be ready to aid that work from their pecuniary resources, as God has prospered them. "France needs religion," said the excellent and distinguished Casimir Perier, with his dying breath, twenty-two years ago. This is indeed her *great want.* The remarks which this letter contains respecting the Emperor cannot fail to attract the attention of our readers.

Paris, November 2, 1853.

Rev. Dr. Baird, New-York.

Dear and Honored Brother.—Since our last communication, our situation has not been materially altered; a solution however is at hand, and within two months we shall know what is to become of religious liberty.

We will mention three subjects in this letter. 1st. The growing hostility of Popery towards us. 2nd. The dispositions of our rulers. 3rd. The work of Evangelization itself.

1st. Popery is more than ever interfering with the agency of Evangelical Christians. Not a day passes away but they are denounced to the government. It is especially by insults and calumnies that the Roman Catholic party exerts itself against us. An occurrence took place a short time ago which must not be passed over in silence. The pretended relics of St. Theodosia have been transferred to Amiens. Several French and Foreign bishops attended the ceremony. The following language was held by the famous Abbé Combalot, who bade defiance to Evangelical Christianity. We quote his own words:

"The times we live in are replete with terror, but abundant with consolation and hope. Never was the Papacy, the corner stone of the Church and Society, attacked by enemies more daring, more deadly, more powerful, than those of the present day; and yet, never was it stronger, and better obeyed.

"That Biblical Propaganda, leaning for support on heaps of gold, as prompted by intolerable fanaticism, is levelling its blows at the Papacy. It is the Papacy which Bible Societies intend to destroy. The Biblical Propaganda furiously and desperately exerts itself to establish the dark kingdom of religious anarchy upon the ruins of Catholic unity. Ask the holy Bishop of Geneva, whom I descry in the assembly, and he will tell you what is taking place in the metropolis of Heresy. He will tell you of the rage and anger of Calvin's sons at the sight of that church dedicated to the Immaculate Conception of the most Holy Virgin, which is being erected on the ruined ramparts of Geneva, and which is destined for the fourteen thousand Catholics who have but a poor chapel.*

"The Papacy is weak, suffering, powerless: but it is only when viewed in a terrestrial, temporal, human point of view. Well may it say as St. Paul: '*quis liberabit me de corpore mortis hujus?*' But God answers: '*Sufficit tibi gratia mea, nam virtus in infirmitate perficitur.*' And the Church strengthened, comforted and transformed, says with St. Paul: '*cum infirmior, tunc potens sum.*' That Papacy so weak on the temporal side, is all powerful in the order of divine things.

"See what it has dared, sanctioned and completed in our days. The Papacy revives the Catholic hierarchy in England, Holland, and in Jerusalem. You now contemplate that eminent cardinal who forms the most precious link in that renowned chain of the Catholic bishops in England. His image, [effigy,] it is true, has been dragged in the mire in England; but that is an honor which he has enjoyed in common with the statues of the august mother of God, and with those of St. Peter and Pius IX. How can that hurt the Papacy? it never goes back: it has spoken, it has triumphed. The work of Catholic restoration has been achieved.

"The triumph of the Papacy is still manifesting itself, publicly and universally, by the most significative development of the worship of the Holy Virgin, and of the relics of the Saints. It is under the most solemn and most astonishing circumstances that St. Theodosia comes to sit upon our altars. It behoves us to transmit to posterity the imperishable memory of that matchless solemnity which has been witnessed by that temple, that city, by Heaven and earth. Let the chisel of the sculptor, and the art of the lapidary, supply a shrine worthy of receiving the sacred bones of our dear and beloved Theodosia. On the external side of that shrine, one shall contemplate the Immaculate Virgin trampling upon the seven headed Dragon. The seven heads of the Dragon shall bear the following names written in fiery letters:—1. Protestantism. 2. Jansenism. 3. Rationalism. 4. Freemasonry. 5. Socialism. 6. Anarchy. 7. Atheism."

* A letter from Geneva which we will give in our next will throw some light on this passage.—*Editor of the A. & F. Ch. Union.*

At the same time, the ultra montane party is unmasking itself, so that we can read its true name, *Persecution*. We shall quote an abstract of a recent paper published by the *Univers Religieux*, under date of October 26. It is an answer to the *Journal des Débats*, which spoke with becoming severity of the observations on the Edict of Nantes, in a critique on the book entitled, "*History of the Protestant Refugees*," by *M. Charles Weiss*. The paper in the *Univers Religieux* runs as follows:

"The editor condemns the revocation of the Edict of Nantes because of its disastrous consequences, because of the fatal circumstances by which it was attended, and because of the principle by which it was prompted. The disastrous consequences of the revocation of the Edict of Nantes are not obvious. Why does M. De Sacy,* blame Louis XIV? Is it for sacrificing his power, prosperity and glory to religion? The unity of France was secured; the Protestant State which the Edict of Nantes had established in the midst of the kingdom,—which had frequently allied itself with the enemies of France, and which, by a difference of public worship, led the minds to indifference and libertinism,—that Protestant State, I say, was completely destroyed.

"According to M. De Sacy, the influence of Madame de Maintenon was worse than that of Louvois. He prefers the dragonnades† to the alms. All the labor undertaken by Anne of Austria, continued by Louis XIV. developed by Madame de Maintenon; all the admirable charity used in withdrawing the Protestants from error, and in leading to truth those who had perceived it,—these works, called the *works of the new Catholics*, in which Bossuet, Fenelon and St. Vincent de Paul employed themselves, are considered by M. De Sacy as works of seduction and corruption. He sees nothing in them but conversions bought at the price of six livres (francs) a piece.

"The occasion on which the *dragonnades* took place is well known. M. De Sacy who prefers the *dragonnades* to the influence of Madame de Maintenon, blames Louis XIV. severely for using them. He is well aware that this word awakens a thousand phantasmagories in the minds of his readers. He does not say that this measure amounted to nothing more than putting bailiff's men in the houses of the Protestants. Such a measure was expensive, annoying and tyrannical; granted; but it was not cruel; it was commonly used during the seventeenth century. Bailiff's men were put in the towns which refused to pay taxes.

"It was the most depraved and fanatical portion of the Protestants who resisted the efforts attempted for their conversion. The Protestant refugees

* Mr. De Sacy is the Editor of the "Journal des Débats."

† The dragonnades was the pursuing and destroying of the Protestants by companies of *dragoons*, of which there was much at the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes.

were not martyrs. Those alone are martyrs who suffer persecution for righteousness sake; there is no righteousness where there is no truth. Never has the Church done away with that doctrine or that law. According to its tradition it is lawful to employ material force against error. The epigrams of M. De Sacy might be piquant; his eloquence might be great. The Church will not change her doctine or tradition. She will always be able to account for it to human reason, which can never establish something useful or serious without imitating the Church."

2nd. Such is the hostility manifested by Popery. Has it exerted much influence over the Government? It has exerted too much. The Government however will not be prevailed upon to come to open persecution. Too many and various interests are at stake. There is ground to hope that Evangelical Christians will have to suffer less than was apprehended. Last week Pastor Lesavoureun came from the Haute Vienne, intending to speak to the Emperor about our twelve schools which have been interdicted. He could not obtain an audience from the Emperor, who was at his seat at Compiegne. But he called upon the minister of the Public Instruction, who was very civil to him, and assured him that if these schools (while remaining in connection with the Free Church) should consent to be inspected by consistorial delegates appointed by the government, they might be again opened. There is ground to hope, that, by taking that course, that important branch of our work will not be cut down.

An interesting occurrence took place a few days ago. Several Baptist congregations in the Department of Aisne* had been dissolved: their temples had been shut. They sent delegates to the Emperor, who answered, "I will consider of your affair, I am a friend to religious liberty." What will be the ultimate result is not yet known. Still, if a deputation from all Evangelical Christians were to apply to the Emperor, he would be likely to listen to them; and he might grant us toleration if not complete liberty. We hope that we may soon acquaint you with the decision of the "*Court de Cassation.*" Let our brethren remember us at that important juncture.

3rd. Thanks to the Lord, the spiritual work is abundantly blessed. We have forwarded to you a Bulletin containing an account of the dedication of our Evangelical Chapel at Alençon.† One of our colleagues, the Rev. Ed. De Pressensé, preached at Alençon a fortnight ago, and was deeply impressed at the sight of those several hundreds of hearers, who, but for the agency of our Society, would never have heard the preaching of the Gospel.

We shall not, this day, enter upon any particulars concerning our other Missionary Stations. We shall content ourselves with quoting the following

* The Department of Aisne is in the north of France.

† We will give some extracts from this document in our next number.

letter, relating to one of our principal centres of Evangelization. This letter shows that our Missionary labors are frequently blessed beyond our own expectations.

"I had repaired of late to a city in the centre of France, with no other purpose than that of increasing my stock of information. As I was walking on the Boulevard I descried a new building. Upon my inquiring, I was answered by a group of operatives that it was the Protestant Temple. I was highly interested by the respectful tone in which that answer was returned, and I went on to ask questions. I had for my guide a workman whom I knew to be honest and intelligent. The others did not know that I was a Protestant. I learned there things which greatly surprised and cheered me. I learned that in a city,—where I thought there were only a few Protestants, without any place of worship,—there was a religious movement which had been prompted by Him alone who scatters the seed where He pleases. I learned that six thousand operatives were Protestant at heart, and would have already declared themselves, but from an apprehension that their employers might dismiss them. The temple, as I have said, is situated on a Boulevard, or public walk. To avoid observation they attend worship in small groups of six or seven. Each group of six operatives buy a Bible and circulate it among them. I have seen several of these Bibles, and have been able to ascertain that these operatives know the glad tidings as well as I do. They are still nominally Catholics. I could not help thinking that the zeal of those new proselytes contrasted strikingly with that of the acknowledged Protestants.

"The circumstances which have given a strong impulse to that religious movement are the following. An institution under the supervision of some Protestant ladies had been established in that town, and gave gratuitous instruction to the children of the operatives. Owing to some intrigues, at whose authors it is easy to guess, that institution has been shut. The parents prefer keeping their children at home to sending them to a Catholic school. A great outcry has been raised in the town, and there are some fears of a persecution and a religious war."

We shall add nothing to these lines; in perusing them you will perceive that we have great occasion for encouragement and thankfulness.

Commending our work to your affection and prayers, we remain, dear sir, with Christian regards and much esteem, your's very truly.

* * * * * * *

We now proceed to give a second and most important letter from the Committee of the Evangelical Society of France. It relates, mainly, to the decision of the *Court of Cassation*, (the highest Court of the realm,) and will be read with a very pensive interest. But all is not lost.

Paris, December 19th, 1853.

Rev. Dr. Baird. New York.

Sir, and much esteemed Brother.—We have delayed writing to you, that we might acquaint you with the issue of the legal prosecution carried on against our agent, Rev. M. Porchat. We now are enabled to inform you of the issue of that important question. The cause of religious liberty is decidedly lost before the courts of law of our country. We enter upon a course of countless difficulties, nay, persecutions, which will call for the prayerful sympathy of our brethren.

I will give you some account of the memorable sitting of the *Cour de Cassation*, of Friday, December 9th, in which the right of the Conscience, the right of the Gospel, the right of God, has been trampled upon—in which the law of God has been done away with by the law of man.

It is needless to trace that affair back to its commencement; my previous letters have made them known to you. Suffice it to say, that the case concerned a public worship established at Mamers six years ago; a worship which had never caused the least trouble or tumult, but had, on the contrary, exerted the most beneficial influence upon a population whose political passions were ardent. The authorities had highly acknowledged the honorable character of Pastor Porchat, whose mild and communicative piety, charity and fidelity had been noticed by the most indifferent. I must add that M. Porchat had been condemned by two inferior courts. The cause of religious liberty was to be decided by the "Cour de Cassation," which is the supreme tribunal in our country, whose province it is to determine the construction of the law, and whose decisions are not to be appealed from. The fact that M. Porchat had already been condemned by two inferior courts of law, was no aggravating circumstance; as every case that is brought before the supreme tribunal has been already decided twice. There was, therefore, no secondary question to interfere with the great question of religious liberty.

I have already stated the point at issue. The question to be decided was, whether a public worship cannot be established without a license from the government—a license which, being granted only during pleasure, may always be withdrawn, and thus hangs up the sword of Damocles over every work of Evangelization, and counteracts the development of the most hopeful works, for that very reason that they are hopeful, and consequently, obnoxious to the Romish clergy and to the authorities who seek the support of that worm-eaten prop.

Those who assert the necessity for a license, apply to meetings for worship the articles 291 and 294 of our code, which pronounce severe penalties against the meeting of more than twenty persons. Under the monarchy of July 1830, we maintained, with more or less success, that these

articles were not applicable to meetings for worship. The Revolution of 1848 acknowledged the rights of religious liberty. When, at a later period, the "*right of association*" was placed under certain restraints, an exception was made in behalf of religious meetings. After the Revolution of December 2d, 1851, a new Constitution was established, which proclaimed the rights of religious liberty. But on the 25th of March, 1852, a decree was issued, declaring that the articles 291 and 294 were applicable to any meeting whatever. That decree did not mention the *religious meetings;* and it was allowable to maintain that these meetings could take advantage of the general principle of religious liberty. The "Cour de Cassation" had to decide whether that untoward decree actually destroyed the liberty of worship. A more solemn question could not be brought before that tribunal.

The aspect of the audience-chamber was consonant with the seriousness of the cause at issue. The audience-chamber of that court is generally little attended. Our countrymen evince no eagerness to hear abstruse discussions about law. On Friday last the audience-room was crowded. Not the Independent Protestants alone, but all the Protestants, friends of the Gospel, had flocked thither. All were sensible that this day was an eventful one. Many a fervent prayer had been offered up. Almost all the Independent pastors were present. The President of the Consistory of Paris, M. Juillerat, and Pastors, Ad. Monod, Grand Pierre, Paumier, &c. a great number of ladies and gentlemen, several operatives—in a word, people of all classes of society were there, showing by their presence that the cause of religious liberty is the common cause of all Christians.

One of the magistrates of the court opened the proceedings by reading a report of the case. The conclusion was against religious liberty. When the reading was over, our brother and friend, M. Jules Delaborde, a member of the Committee of the Evangelical Society of France, and of the Taitbout church, arose, and acted as counsel for the defence. His noted probity, his Christian character, his remarkable talents, have placed him in an eminent station among the barristers who are licensed to plead before the "Cour de Cassation." This year, he has been elected by his colleagues chairman of the barristers of that court. From his distinguished abilities, his profound professional learning, and his oratorical powers, he was eminently qualified to be the champion of that noble cause. But his main force was drawn from his Christian convictions, which manifested themselves in his impressive words. Thanks be to God, the true principles have been powerfully testified to; and if we have lost our suit, our Standard has been gloriously planted upon the disputed ground. After stating the importance of the question, M. Delaborde has shown with much clearness the demands and claims of religious liberty. Man, he said, has not only a right to be free in his conscience, but also in the manifestations of his conscience in the worship

which he owes to God. The government has no right to interfere with conscience, and with its manifestation, either individual or collective; except in the case where, under a religious pretence, one would organize rebellion. Our worship being public, our temples are open to the police officers; they may enter them at any time; they may ascertain the salubrity of the place of worship, the good order of the meeting; this is their province. But if they presume to judge of the doctrines which are taught, to allow or to prohibit the teaching of this or that doctrine—this is an unwarrantable stretch of power; this is placing the right of conscience at the mercy or the caprice of the government. M. Delaborde has set against this pretension the spirit of the principles of 1789, which every Constitution pretends to apply, and especially the very clauses of our new Constitution, which clearly acknowledges the liberty of worship. He has asked whether a decree could annihilate a Constitution, and he has proved, with much acuteness, that a more liberal construction could be put on the decree of the 25th of March, 1852. Towards the close of the speech, the barrister disappeared before the Christian; it was not a pleading, but a testifying to his faith. "I identify myself," he said, "with those in whose behalf I am pleading. I speak, not merely as a barrister, but as a believer. Willing to obey Cæsar in the things which are Cæsar's, we ask you to let us obey God in the things that are God's."

A Christian conscience had spoken: pettifoggery replied. The Solicitor General, who, when a barrister, had advocated religious liberty, rose up. He knows no more his ancient client; nay, he thinks himself obliged to oppose him. Notwithstanding his distinguished abilities, there was in his speech something constrained and embarrassed. He servilely abode by the terms of the decree of March, 1852. He made that decree supersede the rights of conscience. He maintained that religious liberty was nothing more than the legal coexistence of several worships: but that it did not extend so far as to permit the establishing of a new worship without a special license: that the state had a right to prohibit the establishment of a new worship, and to keep those religions which are in the pay of the state, within their own boundaries.

Such a language you could scarcely understand in your free and Protestant country. What a misuse of words! Is it not a mockery to speak of religious liberty on such conditions as these? That liberty, to use the words of our comic dramatists, is only the liberty to abstain from this or that thing; it is purely negative. What? It will not be in my power to manifest my religious convictions; to worship God according to the dictates of my conscience; to withdraw from an established religion; to turn a Baptist, a Wesleyan, a Congregationalist—and I shall be told that I enjoy religious liberty! It is adding mockery to iniquity! It is really a bad jest!

Alas! that impious jest has been sanctioned by the decision of the court. They have confirmed the sentences passed by the tribunal of Mamers, and of Le Mans. Religious liberty has been done away with in our country. What shall we do? From a moral point of view, the answer is obvious. We take it in St. Paul's words: "Woe unto me if I preach not the Gospel!" We have no two courses left. God commands us to preach the Gospel; we *will* preach the Gospel. Souls are hungering and thirsting; nothing can prevent us from endeavoring to supply their wants. We know that we have the prison to encounter. We will go forward, and it is not you, Dear Brethren, who will abandon us.

But we must leave no means untried to enlighten public opinion. In the first place, we must appeal to Cæsar; we must ask him to declare himself. We are contemplating an application to the Emperor, of which we shall give you some detail in our next letter.

In the second place, we shall incessantly appeal to public opinion. With that view, we have just commenced a *Review*, to which we shall, by and by, draw your attention.

My next letter will bring you some curious details of what is going on in some of our missionary stations. You will see that the struggle is everywhere. You will aid and encourage us in this emergency of God's work in our land.

With Christian regards and much esteem, I remain, dear sir, your's very truly, in the name of the Committee. * * * * * *

## BELGIUM.

The following extracts from a letter of a Protestant pastor in Belgium, to a friend in New-York, will be read with interest. The writer is connected with the Established Protestant Church of that kingdom, which it will be seen now embraces ten congregations. It is pleasant to see that there is a growing spirit of missions in that little body, and that by the side of the "Free Church" of that country they are endeavoring to build up the kingdom of our Lord.

"The christian interest with which you have received my verbal communications relative to the condition of the Protestant Church in Belgium, has prompted me to address you a letter before my departure from London, in order that you may be able to make it known to our brethren in America, and if possible to interest some of them in the good work going on in this country.

"The church in the name of which I here act, is, as you know, recognized by the State, which according to the Constitution, supports its worship. And by the way, that is the only manner in which in Belgium the govern-

ment has anything to do with the Church. However, in that respect, we have no complaint to make. Very far from it; for whilst the Roman Catholic Faith, which is that of the immense majority of the inhabitants of the country, costs annually only fifty centimes, (10 cents,) per head, the state does, in proportion, about ten times as much for the worship of the five or six thousand Protestants, who compose the eight parishes of the recognized Church.

"But, as you can see, from the printed report which I had the pleasure of sending you, our Church has for some time been engaged in the way of Evangelization, and this second year, (1852–53,) we have had the joy of seeing our ecclesiastical body increased by two new congregations, (those of Cuesmis and of La Bouverie, near Mons, in the province of Hainaut,) composed almost entirely of persons born in the Church of Rome. We could not, before God, do otherwise than receive these two congregations, and give each of them a pastor, although six of our nine schools are sustained either entirely or in part at our expense. A post of Flemish Evangelization at Vilvorde and Malines in Brabant; a work of Bible colportage undertaken with success in Flanders, were already a burden out of proportion to the small resources which we have been able to command until now. Accordingly our last budget shows a deficit of about $500 for the works in progress.

"I would remark that for all these Missionary labors, above mentioned, nothing is to be hoped for from the State, not only because it does already more than its duty towards the Protestant Church, but also, and especially, because it does not enter within its sphere to support laborers for proselyting.

"As for ourselves, we have made and shall continue to make efforts, but we, of ourselves, are not capable to meet their wants; because the few Protestants of Belgium are, with but few exceptions, people without resources, living by the daily labor of their hands, and who in this situation are already in a position that demands great sacrifices for the completion of the temple in which they are to worship God.

"We have but a feeble hope of receiving anything from England, and at any rate it cannot possibly be before the middle of next year. Until then we need more than ever to walk by faith. I thought, then, to profit by the fortunate meeting with you in London, to make an appeal to the liberal charity of the brethren in America, an appeal which I pray God to bless both to them and to us."

## IRELAND.

The Rev. Mr. King prosecutes his work of "lecturing" with his usual energy and spirit. In the autumn he visited many places in the western part of the island. He will deliver several courses of

lectures this winter. We were in hopes to give in this number a very interesting paper from his pen on the State of Ireland, and what is doing there, but room is wanting.

### SWEDEN.

Want of room compels us also to defer to our next number a very interesting report from Mr. Rosenius, one of our missionaries in Sweden. There is a singular state of things in that country.

### CANADA AND HAYTI.

We give nothing from Canada this month, save that the good work is steadily advancing there, as we learn from our friends.

As to Hayti, we are glad to say that the Rev. Mr. Waring feels encouraged to hope that the difficulties which the police at Don Don had created will be discontinued.

### VALPARAISO.

The Rev. Mr. Williams is much encouraged in his school, it has thirty-six pupils.

## ITALY.

### THE WALDENSIAN CHURCHES; LETTER FROM THE REV. DR. REVEL.

We have great pleasure in laying before our readers the following very interesting letter from the Rev. Dr. Revel. It is replete with good news. What an "open door" the Saviour is setting before His Church in the country of Piedmont! We hope that our readers will give particular attention to the closing remarks of Dr. Revel's letter. In these times of such abundant prosperity with us as a nation, it ought not to be difficult to find the sum needed to build and finish the church at Pignerol. Our Board sent $2000 for that object three months ago; they have about $2000 more in hand, devoted to the same good work. The sum of $2000 more is needed. It ought not to be needed long; who will help?

La Tour, Vallies of the Waldenses, Piedmont, Nov. 16th, 1853.

My dear Dr. Baird,

We are happy to find ourselves in the midst of our old friends and at our former occupations; which latter are continually increasing, of this, however, I do not for a moment complain. The work of the Lord is developing slowly, but, I think that I can say perceptibly, in the bosom of our ancient churches, whilst it is remarkable in the midst of the Romish population, among whom our friends are laboring. You know that we have at this

present time *twenty agents*—evangelists, school-teachers, and colporteurs, all very active and devoted, and all of them assure us that there is more to do than they can accomplish. The government has never troubled us in our work, because it is convinced that, so far as its interests are concerned, we pursue a mission of order, morality, and liberty. When we commenced our work of evangelization in the city of Genoa, the magistrates imagined that we were going to make a propaganda of political demagogueism. They watched most strictly the movements of our evangelist, who was greatly surprised at a later day to learn, at the office of the police, that they had informed themselves not only of the persons with whom he had any relations, what was said in his public and private religious meetings, how many letters he received, whence they came, (they did not open them,) but that they also knew when he retired at night, and at what hour he arose in the morning, of how many meals he partook every day, and of what they consisted,* etc. etc. Finally, they confessed to him that they were entirely satisfied with his movements and his work. Recently the government even gave to him the book of the Civil Authority for the recording of the marriages, baptisms and deaths of the people of our religious faith; which is equivalent to a formal and legal recognition of our new church of Genoa.

The Archbishop of that city has been greatly excited by the progress which the Gospel is there making. In a recent pastoral letter he conjures the people of his diocese to be on their guard against the Waldensian heresy! The cry of alarm by the Romish prelate, and a vigorous reply of one of our evangelists, have produced a considerable increase of hearers in our chapel—which is now too small for our necessities.

At Turin the Gospel gains ground every day. The new church, capable of containing more than 1000 persons, will soon be full. The priests are troubled; power, credit, and worldly advantages are escaping from their hands on all sides. A remarkable fact indicates that they feel to the quick their critical position. They have seen the necessity of changing their tactics in respect to us. Until now they always and exclusively attacked us with the arms of scorn, of calumny, and gross insult, without ever entering into an examination of the truths which our Church teaches. For several months they have established controversial or polemic preachers, who explain to their adherents the falseness and the danger of the Evangelical doctrines—admitting that they are invading their camp. This change of procedure is doubly agreeable and advantageous to us. It betrays, to the eyes of even the least clear-sighted, the real weakness of the adversary. It gives

* Our readers will gain from this statement an idea of the *surveillance* of the police in some countries, and the extent and perfection of the *espionage*, or *spy-system*. In our happy country we have nothing of the sort.

us an opportunity to maintain publicly our principles, and to combat the Romish errors, which we could not, if we were not provoked to do it, because the law punishes those who seek to bring into discredit the Religion of the State. In repelling the unjust accusations and the absurdities promulgated by Fra Melone, the champion of Popery, we only disclose in the eye of the law the absurdities contained in the so-called religious principles of an individual, whose opinions are not more sacred than ours. These polemical conferences, established in various churches in Turin, have given birth to a journal, *Il Rogantino*, which is very ably edited, inflicting heavy blows upon them from the stand-point of the Gospel. The people are as favorable as the Government to the dissemination of the Holy Scriptures, and the truths of the Gospel. We have sent, during their vacation, two of the professors of our College on a tour through different provinces of Piedmont, in order to learn the mind of the people. Everywhere they have been well received. They have had meetings, and have sold many Bibles. Our colporteurs must use certain precautions not to come into collision with the law. These being complied with, they may travel everywhere, and sell the Holy Scriptures freely. To give you an idea of what has already been done, and what can be reached in this respect, I think I cannot do better than translate for you a letter from a Roman Catholic lady to her Confessor. This letter, which may be fictitious, but which establishes what I wish to demonstrate, is published in the *Gazzetta del Popolo*, a very popular journal, which has at least 15,000 subscribers, and each copy of which must have at least four readers. Here it is: "Reverend Sir! You are astonished that I have suddenly emancipated myself from your spiritual direction! And I am astonished that you are astonished at it! You ought surely to have expected that the error would not last forever, and that your imposture would be exposed some time or other. Here methinks I hear you howl, 'O, poor woman! who is the liberal, the libertine, the rascal who has so changed you?' 'That rascal! It is *you*, Reverend Sir. Yes, it is you. For a very long time half a suspicion had arisen in my heart that your words, your directions, and your insinuations tended more to the advantage of the *shop*" (to the advantage of the hideous traffic which Rome makes in sacred things) "than that of religion; more for the good of your body than for that of my soul. But who would have dared to affirm it aloud—the more so because you always cited in support of your words the Latin of the Gospel? At length, curious to know if all you told me in *Latin* was true, also in *Italian*, do you know what I did? I bought *Diodati's* Bible—that book of which there is not at this hour a family, ever so little Christian, which does not possess a copy; that book whose diffusion could never be stopped, even were you to heap together all the *priests of the shop*, all the bishops, the Grand Duke of Tuscany, and Pius IX. besides. I gave myself, therefore, to

reading attentively and conscientiously that truly Divine volume. Do you wish to know what I find there? I find that in many places it says directly the contrary of what you wish to make me believe. I find that you pervert a great number of passages, to make them say what they do not say. I find that there are many verses—I am mistaken, there are many entire pages of the Gospel, of which you never had spoken a word to me because they say what you would not desire to have said. I found that you and your fellows had abundant reasons for excommunicating, for imprisoning, and (if God permits) for burning all, whoever they may be, who read the Bible in a vulgar tongue, and not in Latin; because it is only on this condition that *your* trade is possible. I found, in a word, that you and your fellows, I say your fellows, are a mass of impostors; that you care no more for the salvation of our souls than for the buttons of your old coat; and who have put on your head your three-cornered hat * only to procure the means of growing fat at the expense of the fools who have had the good nature to believe you. I propose to develop at a later day the truths which I have just pointed out. Adieu!"

I am much mistaken if this does not represent clearly the nature of the ground on which we are called upon to sow the good seed. It appeals to your heart as well as to ours; "now is the accepted time, now is the day of salvation." We must seek to cast everywhere, without noise, the good seed of the Word of life; but we must likewise cause this word to be publicly proclaimed as extensively and as soon as possible. To erect a church in a city, to collect there a congregation, is to exercise our rights, to establish them in deed, and to place ourselves in a condition to make them respected even by those who have the greatest interest in contesting them. The church at Turin is finished, that of Nice is secured; we desire to be able to build one at Pignerol during the year 1854. We have purchased the ground, procured the plan of a simple, beautiful and convenient building; it will be an *American Church*, of a modest style. There will be a school for boys and one for girls in the basement, and the church will be in the first story. I hope that it will be wholly American, both as regards its form and its character. Would it be impossible for you to obtain, this winter, donations from our generous brethren of the United States, amounting to $4000 in addition to what you have already collected for Pignerol? This is about the sum which we need, and according to the precept of the Saviour, (Luke xiv. 28–30,) we dare not commence the building without knowing where to find the means to finish it.

Will you be so kind as to beg our American brethren not to forget that it was an Italian who discovered their beautiful "Terrestrial" country. It

* The priests in some countries in Italy, and Piedmont among them, wear the three-cornered hat.

seems to us that since they have it in their power, they ought particularly to aid us in procuring for the poor Italians access to the "celestial."

I perceive that my letter is already of an unreasonable length; be so good as to excuse it. I presume that during the winter you will see a number of those precious friends whom I had the honor to salute in Christ in your New World, so attractive in so many respects. Have the goodness to tell them how I rejoice to reproduce in my memory the features of their friendly countenances, and to recall in my heart the testimonies of their fraternal affection. Receive for yourself, my dear friend, and present to your worthy and excellent colleagues, my thanks and my most cordial and Christian salutations.

J. P. Revel.

CHAPEL AT ROME.

Rev. Charles W. Baird, after receiving ordination in the month of October, returned to Rome, where he is diligently prosecuting his work as preacher for the American chapel.

## View of Public Affairs

Congress achieved but little before the holidays, but since that time it has advanced *in medias res* with more than ordinary dispatch. Several great measures have been brought forward, and there is a reasonable prospect that a good deal of business will be accomplished. Thus far the great subjects entered upon have been: *Rail-roads to connect the Valley of the Mississippi with the Pacific coast; the Clayton and Bulwer Treaty; the Increase of the Navy; and the organization of the Nebraska Territory.* Other and less important questions have had a considerable share of the attention of Congress.

The Legislatures of several of the States have convened, and the messages of some of the Governors are documents of more than usual importance, as showing the progress of individual sections of the country. Everywhere evidences of material prosperity abound. Would that we could report an equal advance in Spiritual matters! And yet there are blessings of that sort to call for grateful praise.

The attention of the country has been arrested to a painful degree by a disgraceful riot at Erie, in Pennsylvania, which for weeks has greatly impeded the travel on the railroads which traverse

that borough, and connect Buffalo and the East with Cleveland and the West. At length the action of the United States Court and the authority of the State were brought to bear on the subject, and order has been partially restored. It is astonishing that men can give way so inconsiderately to their passions and prejudices, and perpetrate, in a moment of excitement, what can never be soberly thought of in future years without the deepest regret.

In several cities there have been disturbances on account of Monsignor Bedini. We greatly fear that if his Eminence does not leave the country soon, he will find his effigy burning in every large town whither he may direct his steps. We sincerely hope that as he has been the *first* Nuncio, so he will be the *last* who will be sent to us from his Holiness—at least, the last envoy that sustains the double character of a political agent and an ecclesiastic.

From Europe the news continues to be interesting and exciting, and must long be so. The war between Russia and Turkey has been going on to some extent, notwithstanding the unfavorable season of the year. The destruction at Sinope of a portion of the Turkish fleet, (several frigates and small vessels, together with some transports,) which had been engaged in carrying troops and munitions of war to the eastern end of the Black Sea, has greatly elated the Russians. The victory has compensated for the losses sustained by their armies in the beginning of the war, in the Valley of the Danube. This unlooked for event has had the effect to induce France and England to send their combined fleet from the Bosphorus into the Black Sea, where, it would seem, it ought to have been long ago and before the port of Sebastapol, if it is intended to keep the Russians in check. There have been battles in Asia, and a severe conflict at Kalafat, but we have few details that are worthy of confidence.

It is evident that if England and the other Western Powers do not succeed this winter in arranging the difficulty between the belligerent nations, there is reason to expect serious times next summer. The great neutral Powers are much averse to going to war for the sake of Turkey; but it is feard that France will, before long, insist upon open war with Russia. Should that occur, who can tell us the results to the nations of the mighty struggle, in which no one will gain more than the enemies within their own bosoms?

A deep sympathy is felt for Turkey in all countries where there

is any real liberty, from the belief that she is in the right. But if it should turn out to be true, as is reported, that a Turk has recently been put to death at Adrianople for having embraced Christianity and for refusing to deny Christ, the fact will do much to change that sympathy into disgust and abhorrence. We think that the great Christian Powers which have espoused the interests of Turkey, and especially Great Britain, are much to blame for not having demanded of that government, *as a condition of their friendly intervention*, that entire religious liberty should be guaranteed to Mussulman and Jew, as well as to Christian, throughout the Ottoman empire. They owed it to their common Christianity to do it. Alas! when shall we see Christian governments, even the best of them, acting as becomes the religion they profess? It may be long before so good an opportunity will again occur for England and France to gain such a concession to the interests of justice and the Gospel.

But our Heavenly Father will order all things well. He is carrying forward his wonderful scheme of mercy and justice in relation to our world, which nothing can defeat. How full of consolation to the Christian mind is this great truth, which the Bible alone reveals to man. What light it sheds on the affairs of this world—of individuals and of nations. Here let us rest.

P. S. As we are going to press, (January 7th,) Father Gavazzi takes his leave of us to return to Europe, and to his "dear Italy," if the way be open for it. He goes in the Pacific, one of the Collins' steamers. Many of his friends accompanied him to the ship. His visit to this country lasted less than ten months. By his lectures, heard or read, he has done much to make our people give their thoughts to some subjects about which very many of them have had much to learn. We are not disposed to endorse or to approve of every thing which he or any other man may say or do, yet we cannot but believe that Father Gavazzi's visit to our country will do much good in many ways. May he live to accomplish much for Italy!

We have not words with which to express the sadness and dissatisfaction with which we have read the account which M. Galliardet has given of the "Soule duels" at Madrid. Whilst we can appreciate the filial ardor of the young man, which led him to vindicate (even in an unrighteous way) the character of his mother—though we cannot see that the provocation was worthy of notice—we are at a loss to conceive how the father could have so far lost all sense of

propriety, and of duty to the Government which he represented, as to quarrel and fight with the French Ambassador. He should have resigned his post as Ambassador from the United States to the Court of Spain before he resolved to fight a duel for any cause. We are led to inquire in what times do we live? Certainly we must be going back to the middle ages, when men can fight duels on account of the *dress* of a lady! And this is done by the diplomatic representatives of two of the greatest nations of the world—both of which boast of their superior civilization!

## Movements of Rome.

Whilst our last number was going through the press there was no little excitement in the City of New-York, owing to the fact that the Mayor had caused a Mr. Parsons,—a worthy and zealous man who had for years been in the habit of preaching in the open air on the Sabbath, but always on private ground, it is said,—to be arrested, for fear of a riot. This precaution was taken from good motives, without doubt; nevertheless the step was as injudicious as it was illegal. Mr. Parsons had violated no law; and consequently it was the duty of the Mayor to send a sufficient police-force, if he had reason to apprehend that a disturbance would be made, as had been threatened by some Irish Roman Catholics whom Mr. P. had offended by his remarks the Sabbath previous. It was *protection*, and not *prevention* which the times demanded.

The magistrate who examined the case instantly liberated Mr. Parsons, because he saw that he had been unlawfully arrested. This was far from satisfying the disappointed crowd, many of whom marched past the house of the Mayor to express their dissatisfaction at his conduct, as well as to convince him of their determination to sustain the preacher.

Towards the end of the week the Mayor issued a Proclamation, exhorting the people to be quiet, and setting forth a City Statute made some years ago in regard to street-preaching, but which Mr. Parsons had not violated. The Proclamation was felt to be uncalled for, and consequently it did but little to allay the excitement.

Another Proclamation, in the shape of a "Pastoral," from Archbishop Hughes, addressed to his "clergy" and his "children," appeared on the same day on which that of the Mayor was published.

That remarkable document has done much to open the eyes of the people to the boundless ambition of the prelate, and to the danger to be apprehended from the Roman Catholic Church, should it ever become domi-

nant among us. It furnished the spectacle of a Romish Bishop hastening to the help of the civil power when his help was in no wise needed; and all this in order to show his vast influence over those who profess the Romish faith, and to secure the good opinion of ignorant and ambitious politicians. Besides, his address or letter to his co-religionists, though specious, in reality incited them to acts of violence, in case a pretext for their doing so should present itself.

We are happy to say that this action of his Grace was condemned in the severest terms by the papers of the city. Among those who came out in the most decided manner we may mention the *Tribune*, the *Times*, the *Evening Post*, the *Commercial Advertiser*, the *Journal of Commerce*, the *Sun*, the *Herald*,—in fact almost every paper, excepting the two or three that are Roman Catholic in their character and spirit. Among the religious papers the *New-York Observer*, the *Evangelist*, the *Independent*, the *New-York Recorder*, the *Christian Advocate*, were found where we might expect to find them. Even papers in the interior cities took up the subject. No paper contained anything better than what appeared in the editorial columns of the *Pittsburgh Gazette*.

On the whole, great good will grow out of all this. We think that Archbishop Hughes will pause a long time before he will do such a thing hereafter.

About the same time Cincinnati was the scene of a more terrible excitement. The German Association of "Freemen," resolved to avail themselves of the visit to that city, of Monsignor Bedini, the Papal Nuncio, to testify their abhorrence of a man who had been one of the greatest enemies to the sacred cause of liberty in Italy, and considered the murderer of Ugo Bassi, at Bologna in 1849, by burning him in effigy! For this purpose they assembled at their hall on Christmas evening, and thence marched by Archbishop Purcell's house, (where the Nuncio was a guest,) on their way to the place where they were going to burn the effigy which they had prepared. Just as they arrived near to the Archbishop's house an onset was made upon them by a strong body of policemen, with whom a certain Judge Spooner was to be seen. A great disturbance took place, one man was killed, several wounded, and the Germans dispersed. All this was done, so far as we learn, without any warning being given, such as the laws of the State of Ohio demand, by the order of the Mayor! Of course great excitement took place, and Judge Spooner and more than one hundred policemen were indicted and ordered to appear before a magistrate to answer for their illegal conduct. Nor was the excitement allayed by Archbishop Purcell's sending to the president of the "Association of Freemen" the contemptible sum of $10, as an expression of his sympathy for the afflicted families. The profered gift was rejected with scorn. Really it would seem as if Rome—

through her own infatuated course—was resolved to ruin her cause in these United States. What folly to send such a man as Bedini as Nuncio to this country.

It is well that the Pope has appointed his Eminence to be the Papal Nuncio at the Court of Spain. He will feel more at home there. He has been burned in effigy in Wheeling, Philadelphia, Louisville and Baltimore already; and there is a prospect of his receiving *such* honors in any part of our land whither he may direct his steps.

Rome is also getting into serious difficulty in Prussia and Baden, where the insolence of her clergy, and especially her Archbishops, is compelling the Governments to adopt strong measures. In the Grand Duchy of Baden the Jesuits have been ordered out of the country, and every priest who read to his church a certain "Pastoral" of the Archbishop of Freiburg, has been fined ten florins, (or five dollars nearly,) for so doing. This is taking strong grounds. So it will be everywhere. The vaulting ambition of Rome will everywhere over shoot the mark. Rome is cunning enough, but not wise. Withal, she is doomed to destruction.

---

# Juvenile Department.

## DIALOGUE No. 11.

BETWEEN A FATHER AND HIS TWO SONS, EDWARD AND WILLIAM.

### Of France: (Fifth Conversation.)

*Willie.* Dear Father, you are to tell us in this conversation something about the *Massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day* in France.

*Father.* Yes, Willie, you may remember that we had reached that point when we stopped in our last conversation. But can you tell me when St. Bartholomew's Day occurs?

*Eddie.* It is the 24th day of August, and the Massacre, you told us, took place in the year 1572—wanting only eighteen years of being three centuries ago.

*Father.* The Massacre commenced about midnight, but lasted all of the 24th, and, indeed, more or less for several days, not only in Paris, but in many places throughout France.

*Willie.* Is it known how many people were killed?

*Father.* No, my child—at least, not with certainty. It is not likely that the Government, which alone knew anything like the exact number, was very desirous of telling how great it was. It has been estimated variously. The lowest *supposition*, as far as I can remember, was that

30,000 were killed in Paris; 40,000 in other parts of the kingdom—making 70,000 in all!

*Willie.* Why, Father! That was a great many people to be killed in the course of a few days! There must have been many Protestants in France even at that day.

*Father.* Yes, Willie; it is supposed that there were several millions. Indeed, at one time—not long after the Massacre of St. Bartholomew—it is believed that in some parts of the kingdom they constituted nearly half of the population. And what is remarkable, the doctrines of the Reformation not only spread rapidly among the people, through the reading of the Scriptures, which had been translated into French by Olivetan, the uncle of Calvin, but also among the nobles. In no country did the truth spread more rapidly than in France. Lefevre, Farel, Calvin and Beza, were the great French Reformers. The first General assembly of the Reformed Church in France was held in 1559 and had but eleven members. In the year 1571 there was a General Assembly at Rochelle, at which Beza presided, and could count 2000 Protestant congregations in connexion with it. Some of which were large and had several ministers.

*Eddie.* I think you have told us, dear Father, that Charles IX. was on the throne of France at the time of which we speak. Was he not a son of Henry II. and Catharine de Medici?

*Father.* Yes, my son, he was. He was a young and weak prince, and greatly under the influence of his Italian mother. By his oppressive course he compelled the Protestants to take up arms, under the Prince of Condé and Admiral Coligny. Condé was killed in the battle of Jarnac, where, however, the Protestants gained a victory, under the conduct of Coligny. After three campaigns the Government was compelled to respect, in some measure, the rights of the Protestants, or rather *to let them alone*—for it amounted to little more.

*Eddie.* This was before the Massacre of St. Bartholomew, I suppose.

*Father.* Yes, it was, a few years before. In consequence of this temporary *peace*, or comparative tranquility, the Protestants began again to increase. At length the Queen Mother, the cruel Catharine de Medici, and the clique of bigotted Romanists by whom the court was surrounded, entered upon other schemes for arresting the Reformation and of destroying its adherents. The first measure which they resolved to execute was indeed a bold one, and boldly did they carry it into effect. They made overtures to *Henry of Navarre*, a prince, around whom the Protestants had begun to rally in the hope of one day seeing him King of France.

*Willie.* Who was he, dear Father?

*Father.* He was a son of Anthony, Duke of Bourbon, and *Jeanne d'*

*Albret*, daughter of Henry, King of Navarre. On his mother's side he was the heir to the kingdom of Navarre, a small state lying partly in the south of France and partly in the north of Spain. It has been absorbed into the kingdoms of Spain and France long ago. The French portion, which was indeed the only part in existence at the time of which I am speaking, was annexed to France when this Henry became king of that country, almost twenty years after the Massacre of St. Bartholomew.

*Eddie.* But what had this Henry of Navarre, as you call him, to do with that dreadful affair?

*Father.* I will tell you. He was a Protestant, his excellent mother having instilled into his mind the Protestant doctrines from his earliest years. He was an elegant and accomplished young man—not a Protestant in the sense of being a truly converted man, but rather one from intellectual conviction. He was brave and ambitious, and in after years greatly addicted to sensual pleasures, or sensual vices I should say. If his virtues had been equal to his talents he would have been a most extraordinary man. As it was, he was, through a reign of twenty years, the ablest king France ever had. Well, it was proposed to him to marry "Margaret of Vallois," (as she was called,) the sister of the King of France. This suited his ambition. The marriage occurred in less than a week before the 24th of August, 1572. Many distinguished nobles, together with the brave old Coligny, went up to Paris with him to the nuptials.

*Willie.* Ah, now I understand. This was a plot to get the leaders of the Protestants in their power.

*Father.* Just so; never was a scheme better laid. The Protestants were thrown off their guard. The first thing that excited some apprehension was the fact that, a few days before the marriage was to take place, Admiral Coligny was fired at from the window of a monastery, and wounded severely in his right hand and his left arm. The King hastened to see the old man, and hypocritically exclaimed, as he stood by his bedside: "My father, you have the wounds and I have the pain!" But soon the dreadful hour arrived. At midnight the bell of the Church of St. Germain l' Auxerrois began to sound forth the awful signal! The Protestant chiefs were murdered where ever they could be found! The excellent Coligny was one of the first victims. The Duke of Guise and a numerous company surrounded his house. A worthless German, of the name of Besme, entered his chamber, and notwithstanding the appeals of the brave old man: "Young man, respect these gray hairs, and stain them not with blood," plunged his sword repeatedly into the body of his victim, and then threw it from the window into the court-yard. The Duke of Guise contemplated the mangled form, in which life was not yet extinct, in silence; but the brother of the King, Henry,

Count of Angoleine, spurned it with his foot, and said: "Courage, my friends; we have begun well, let us finish in the same manner." But God is just. Both he and the Duke of Guise came to a miserable end in their turn.

*Eddie.* Did none of the Protestant leaders escape? And what became of Henry of Navarre? A few of the chiefs got notice of the intended massacre in time to fly from the city; but the most of them perished that night or during the next day. As to Prince Henry of Navarre, he was in the Palace, where he was safe in the chamber of his wife. But even he, in order to save his life, was compelled to profess himself a Papist. "Death mass, or the Bastile," were the alternatives which the enraged King set before him. This forced profession he abjured as soon as he got away from these scenes, and for nearly twenty years more considered himself a Protestant.

*Willie.* Then the King was one of the greatest enemies of the Protestants?

*Father.* He was, my child; he was a poor, weak bigot; a tool in the hands of the "Guise Faction," as it was called, and *it* was a mere tool of Rome. As to the King, he behaved like a mad-man, and was seen at the windows of the Louvre (the palace in which he lived) with a musket in his hand, and as he shouted to the assassins, "Kill, kill," he fired upon his wretched and fugitive subjects! I have often looked up at those windows, and often passed the house in which it is said the good Admiral Coligny was murdered. But I cannot describe to you, my dear children, the emotions of my heart whilst I endeavored to recall, in imagination, these dreadful scenes! One reflection, however, was uppermost in my mind. It was that there is a Judgment Day in which all men must give an account of such crimes to One who cannot be deceived, and who is able to punish. There *must* be such a Judgment, and there must be a hell in which wicked men will suffer the punishment due to their crimes.

*Eddie.* But what happened after the Massacre of St. Bartholomew?

*Father.* The Protestants took up arms again; nor did they lay them down until they had placed Henry of Navarre on the throne of France. But of these things and many more we will speak in our next Conversation.

## PUBLIC MEETING IN BALTIMORE.

A very interesting meeting in behalf of the American and Foreign Christian Union was held in the Protestant Methodist Church, in Liberty-st. Baltimore, (of which the Rev. Drs. Stockton and Webster are pastors,) in

the evening of the 9th of December. The Rev. Dr. Roberts, of the Methodist Episcopal Church, presided, and remarks were made by the Rev. Drs. Morris and Hamner, and addresses by the Rev. Dr. Dowling, of Philadelphia, Rev. Stuart Robinson, of Baltimore, and the Rev. Dr. Baird, of New-York. Several excellent resolutions were submitted and adopted.

## AGENT FOR WESTERN NEW-YORK.

The Board have appointed the Rev. Sabin McKinney to the Agency of Western New-York, in the place of the Rev. Mr. Gillette, resigned. We ask for Mr. McKinney a kind reception at the hands of the churches and the pastors.

# Notices of Books.

Oriental and Sacred Scenes, from Notes of Travel in Greece, Turkey and Palestine, by Fisher Howe. This is a beautiful volume of four hundred pages in 12mo. with several illustrations, and full of valuable information, conveyed in very pure and agreeable style. Mr. Howe is a merchant of New-York, a man of well cultivated mind and good judgment. He has prepared an admirable work for the Sunday School library, as well as for all persons who desire to know something of the most interesting countries in the East.

Jacqueline Pascal; or a Glimpse of Convent Life at the Port Royal. This interesting little volume has been published by R. Carter & Brothers. It is made up from the French of Victor Cousin, Prosper Faugére, and the late Professor Vinet, with an introduction by the Rev. Wm. R. Williams, D. D. To any one who desires to see how true piety can exist, and with what difficulties it has to contend, in the Church of Rome, this volume will be invaluable. Jacqueline Pascal was the sister of the celebrated Blaise Pascal, the author of the *Provincial Letters*, and like him, was a Jansenist.

Family Prayers, by the author of "Morning and Night Watches," is the title of a beautiful volume, also from the press of R. Carter & Brothers. It contains a prayer for every morning and evening during a month, with prayers in the latter part of it for special occasions. We think this volume admirably fitted to do good, and can well recommended it. How many heads of families there are who might use such a volume in the morning and evening service, to great advantage! Many would increase the facility of praying appropriately in their families, even by a frequent and serious reading of this volume.

Periodicals. Harpers' Magazine continues to be as interesting as ever. So does the National Magazine—a truly Christian periodical—edited by the Rev. Dr. Stevens. Putnam's Magazine steadily gains ground. It is really *American* in materials and character. Mr. Bidwell's Eclectic Magazine gives us the best articles of the British Magazines in one hundred and forty-four pages monthly, and is cheap enough at the price of $5 per annum.

# Receipts

## ON BEHALF OF THE AMERICAN AND FOREIGN CHRISTIAN UNION, FOR THE MONTH ENDING 10th JANUARY, 1854.

### MAINE.

Kennebunkport, So. Cong. Ch. and Soc'ty. per Rev. G. A. Bowman, . . . $20 00
Bath, Central Ch. ($30 of which to make John Patten, Esq. L. M.) . . . 36 00
Portland, High-st. Ch. Rev. J. W. Chickering, pastor. James Libbey, L. M. $30; Nathaniel Blanchard, John B. Brown, and Ira Crocker, L. Ms. by a friend, $100. High-st. Circle, by Mrs. E. Tyler, of which from Samuel Tyler L. M. $30; and John Neal. $10. $150 to make John Neal, Esq. Mrs. Sarah Ilsley, Miss Sarah M. N. Cummings and Rev. J. H. Turner, L. Ms. 330 00
Bangor, 1st Parish Sabbath School, per Wm. Sandford, . . . 32 00
Hammond-st. S. School to make John Webster, L. M. . . . 30 00

### NEW-HAMPSHIRE.

Newport, Cong. Ch. and Socy. by Rev. Edward P. Woods, . . . . . 9 00
Exeter, 1st Cong. Ch. . . . . 19 57
2nd Cong. Church to make Rev. Asa Mann, L. M. . . . . 28 15
Bapt. Ch. . . . . 2 38
Bennington, Mrs. Deborah Whittemore towards L. M. . . . . 4 00
New Boston, Mrs. Stephen Whipple, L. M. 30 00
Mason Village, Cong. Ch. . . . 9 00

### VERMONT.

W. Rutland, monthly collect'n in S. School of Cong. Ch. to make Dea. Elijah Boardman and Dea. Luke Ward, L. Ms. . . 69 04
St. Johnsbury North Ch. balance, . . 2 00
Brattleboro, Centre Ch. . . . . 69 54
West Ch. . . . . 19 78
Brandon, Cong. Ch. . . . . 17 00
Bapt. Ch. . . . . 11 10

### MASSACHUSETTS.

East Douglass, Rev. J. L. Maynard, add. for L. M. . . . . 10 00
Haverhill, Centre Cong. Ch. bal. . 25
West Ch. in part to make Rev. A. Farwell, L. M. . . . . 15 00
Framingham, Hollis Evan. Church to make Dea. Edmond M. Capen L. M. . . . 30 00
West Newton, Cong. Ch. to make Rev. Joseph S. Clark, D. D., L. M. . . . 31 00
Newton Corner, Eliot Ch. to make Hon. J. W. Edwards L. M. . . . . 37 65
West Springfield, 1st Cong. Ch. . . . 32 14
Springfield, Bapt. Ch. . . . . 10 50
Epis. Meth. Ch. . . . . 7 00
Chicopee Falls, Cong. Chur. to make Rev. Wm. Wright L. M. $31 93. Sab. School to make George S. Taylor L. M. $30. . 61 93
North Wilbraham, Cong. Ch. . . . 10 00
So. Amherst, Cong. Ch. to make Rev. Jas. L. Merrick L. M. . . . . 30 00
West Amesbury, Cong. Ch. . . . . 17 44
Chelsea, Broadway Ch. . . . . 33 37
East Randolph, Cong. Ch. . . . . 25 00
West Randolph, Cong Ch. . . . . 33 04
Shelburne, Cong. Ch. Gent's. Soc'y. $15 85. Ladies Society, $9 36. . . . . 25 21
Bernardston, Cong. Ch. . . . . 1 00
Ashfield, Cong. Ch. . . . . 24 00
Seekonk, Cong. Chur'h in full to make Rev. James O. Barney L. M. . . . . $10 00
Holyoke, 1st Cong. Ch. . . . . 8 00
Boston, Mrs. A. Lawrence, . . . . 9 00

### CONNECTICUT.

Ridgefield, 1st Cong. Church Rev. Clinton Clark, . . . . . 20 00
Brooklyn, Dea. Moses Clark, . . . . 5 00
So. Windsor, 1st Ch. and Soc'y. per Theodore Elmer, . . . . . 21 50
So. Britain, Oliver Pierce to make himself L. M. $30. Miss Nancy P. Mitchel, $3. 33 00
So. Woodstock, Israel Smith in part L. M. per Anna C. Curtis, . . . . . 5 00
Hartford, Jerusha Treat, 3rd payt. for L. M. 10 00
Norwich, First Soc'y. Mrs Thos. Lathrop, 10 00
Hartford, Centre Cong. Ch. in part. Thos. S. Williams, $200; Calvin Day, $25; Loyal Wilcox, $25; F. Parsons. $20; Joseph Trumbull, $20; David Watkinson, $20; Alfred Smith, $20; Chas. E. Fox, $5; E. Fessenden, $5; Cauncey Ives, $5; Wm. M. Judd. $3; S. Bourn, $6; Goodwin & Co. $6; J. Warburton. $10; R. C. Smith, $10; D. Wesson. $10; W. W. House. $10; Tertius Wadsworth $10; H. A. Perkins, $10; C. Seymour, $10; H. Fitch, 10; W. W. Ellsworth, $10; . . . . . 450 00
Pearl-st. (in part.) including Roland Mather, L. M. . . . . 244 36
So. Norwalk, Cong. Church in part to make Dea. A. K. Nash, L. M. . . . . 13 00
New Haven, Additional, College-st. Ch. Sabbath School, . . . . . 16 75
A. Townsend, Jr. $5; Marcus Merriman, $5; G. H. L. of Brooklyn, N.Y. $10; 20 00

### NEW-YORK.

N. Y. City, A Friend, . . . . . 1 00
Durham, Monthly Collection of 1st Presb. Church, . . . . . 1 00
Geddo, Abm. Spear, . . . . . 2 00
N. Y. City, Crowell Adams, . . . . 5 00
Yonkers, Presb. Ch. . . . . 29 75
N. Y. City, E. C. Wilcox, . . . . 5 00
Yonkers, Hervey F. Lombard, to make himself L. M. . . . . 30 00
H. A. Underwood, . . . . . 20 00
Mrs. Baird, $5; Henry M. Baird, $3, 8 00
Boght, Ref. D. Ch. . . . . 3 00
N. Y. City, John Rohner, . . . . . 10 00
Pompey Hill, in part, . . . . . 7 14
Wampsville, . . . . . 11 12
Fayetteville, Balance, . . . . . 9 00
Malone, Balance. . . . . 2 00
Hampton, M. E. Ch. bal. . . . . 50
Amsterdam, Presb. Ch. to make Rev. M. S. Goodall, L. M. . . . 37 35
Bapt. Ch. . . . . 1 00
Deansville, Cong. Ch. bal. . . . . 4 40
Jamaica, Presb. Ch. Rev. Mr. Oakey, add. 5 00
N. Y. City, A friend per Dr. De Witt, . 5 00
Chester, A friend per Dr. Fairchild, . . 2 00
N. Y. City, Rev. John N. Lewis for 1853, 10 00
Mrs. Francis Atkins, . . . . 1 00
Mrs. Kitchen, . . . . . 2 00

### NEW JERSEY.

Newark, Central M. Ch. to make Rev. Mr. Kenny, L. M. . . . . 31 32

Middletown, 1st Ref. Dutch. Ch. Rev. Wm. Reiley, $10 part L. M. . . . . $20 00
New Brunswick, Coll. in 1st Presb. Ch. . . 32 00
Pemberton, M. E. Ch. (add.) . . . . 2 50
Hackettstown, M. E. Ch. . . . . 7 50
O. S. Presb. Ch. Rev. H. N. Wilson, L. M. . . . . 30 00
Hardyston, N. S. Presb. Ch. Rev. J. Campbell, . . . . . 12 00
Trenton, O. S. Presb Ch. in part L. M. of Rev. W. Kirkpatrick, . . . . . 23 85
Newark, Rev. Wm. Bradley, . . . . . 10 00
Baskingridge, Alex. McEowen, Esq. . . 10 00
Clintonville, Reid. D. Ch. to make Rev. N. B. Taylor L. M. . . . . 31 50

PENNSYLVANIA.

Coatsville, O. S. Presb. Ch. Rev. Alex. G. Morrison, part L. M. . . . . 17 00
Pittsburgh, Liberty-st. M. E. Ch. . . . 83 25
Alleghany City, So. Common M. E. Ch. . 26 00
So. Pittsburgh, M. E. Ch. . . . . 10 70
Sewickley, M. E. Ch. . . . . 13 04
Blackburne Chapel, do. . . . . 89
Sharpsburgh, M. E. Ch. . . . . 11 05
Pine Creek, M. E. Ch. . . . . 7 00

MARYLAND.

Taneytown, S. Sentman, Annuity, . . 5 00

DELAWARE.

St. Georges, Presb. Ch. Rev. James C. How in part, . . . . . 17 50
Delaware City, Meth. Epis. Ch. Rev. Mr. Sumption, . . . . . 7 25

VIRGINIA.

Alexandria, 1st Presb. Ch. . . . . 28 02
Miss Sarah F. Smith, $5; Mrs. Danforth, $2; Misses Anderson, $5; 12 00
Morgantown, Breast Pin from a Lady sold for . . . . . 1 25

SOUTH CAROLINA.

Robertsville, Isadore Latique, . . . 4 00

GEORGIA.

Milledgeville, Presb. Ch. to make H. N. Batchelier and D. C. Campbell L. Ms. . 62 40
Meth Ch. . . . . 9 50
Bapt. Ch. . . . . 2 50
Savannah, George P. Harrison, . . . . 4 00
Waynesville, Presb. Ch. to make Rev. Rufus K. Porter, L. M. . . . . 31 75
Griffin. Presb. Ch. in part to make Rev. W. J. Keith L. M. . . . . 16 00

ALABAMA.

Chunnenuggee, James F. Carter, . . 2 00

ILLINOIS.

Springfield. 2d Presb. Ch. per Rev. A. Hale, $12 00
Moline, Cong. Ch. . . . . 7 00
Rock Island Churches, . . . . . 8 50

INDIANA.

Hanover, Rev. W. W. Harsha, . . . 21 00
Marion, Churches, . . . . . 10 00
Crawfordsvile, Churches, . . . . 25 20
Madison, Sarah S. Burnell, Annuity, . . 3 00

OHIO.

Harmar, Benj. P. Putnam's, Sabbath School Class, . . . . . 3 00
Cincinatti. 3rd M. Prot. Ch. in part L. M. of Rev. J. B. Walker, . . . 21 98
Welch Bapt. Ch. part, . . . . 2 25
Soule Chapel M. E. Ch. add. . . . 16 50
Marietta, Cong. Church which makes Rev. Thos. Wicks, L. D. . . . . 101 50
Bapt. Ch. . . . . 14 89
M. E. Centenary Ch. . . . . 8 18
Students of Marietta College, in part L. M. of Prof. J. W. Andrews. . 2 00
Harmer, 1st Cong. Ch.—Douglass Putnam, Esq. to make Rev. David Gould, L. M. $30; David Putnam, Senr. $4; David Putnam, Jr. $5; H. M. and J. M. Amlin, $4; Mrs. Fearing, $1; Dr. Newton, $2; Mrs. Shaw, $2; S. Newton, $3; R. Hayward, $1; J. Newton, $5; M. Giles, $1; J. Fuller, $1; Sabbath School Class, $3; all to make Dea. Stephen Newton, L. M. . . 62 00
Dr. Seth Hart, $2; Mrs. Eliza Whipple, $3; D. Putnam, Jr. 25c. . 5 25
Dayton, 1st Presb. Ch. (O. S) which with last colln. makes Rev. P. D. Gurley, L.D. and Job Haines, M. D., & H. L. Brown, Esq. L. Ms. . . . . 110 79
Dayton, Wesley Chapel, M. Ch. . . . 25 50
Greenwich, Marcus E. Mead, . . . . 2 00

MICHIGAN.

Webster, Mrs. Rebecca Young, annuity, . 5 00
Sharon, Cong. Ch. . . . . 7 79
Dexter, Meth. Ch. . . . . 73
Samuel Dexter,. . . . . 5 00
Jackson, Cong. Ch. to make J. A. Hawley, L. M. . . . . 32 65
Bapt. Ch. . . . . 8 25
Wing Lake, Presb. Ch. . . . . 3 93
E. Bull, . . . . . 3 00
Ann Arbour, Cong, Ch. . . . . 5 32
Clinton, Bapt. Ch. . . . . 3 82
Presb. and Cong. Ch. . . . . 16 76
Saline, Union Meeting, . . . . . 3 30

IOWA.

Keokue, Westminster Presb. Ch. . . 11 00
1st Presb. Ch. . . . . 7 00
Davenport, Cong. Ch. . . . . 16 00

## CONTENTS.


Contents of the present number, . . . 49
Our plate, and the Order of Benedictines, . 49
Roman Catholic Prayers for the Conversion of Protestant Countries, . . . . 51
Mr. Leo's Course of Lectures at Newark, N. J. 54
Liberty of Conscience, . . . . . 57
The Waldensian Church at Turin, . . . . 64
Letter from Lucca—Miss Cunninghame, . 67
The Home Field, . . . . . 68
The Foreign Field, . . . . . 71
View of Public Affairs, . . . . . 85
Movements of Rome, . . . . . 88
Juvenile Department, (Dialogue No. 11,) . 90
Notices of Books, . . . . . 94

# RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

AND

# PROTECTION OF AMERICAN CITIZENS ABROAD.

## GREAT PUBLIC MEETING AT THE TABERNACLE,

New-York, January 26th, 1854.

Supplement to the February Number of the American and Foreign Christian Union.

We issue a Supplement to the February number of our Magazine, in order to give an account of the proceedings of a meeting held on Thursday night, January 26th, in the Broadway Tabernacle, together with the Letters received from distinguished gentlemen who had been invited to attend, the Addresses delivered, &c. &c. We hope that those who receive this pamphlet will not only read it, but also circulate it among their friends. Still more; we would make the earnest request that they would, in conjunction with others—their neighbors and friends—forward, without delay, Memorials (a form of which will be found in the proceedings of the Meeting in question) to both Houses of Congress.

Although the weather was extremely unfavorable, a large number of citizens were present. There were also gentlemen present from Brooklyn, Williamsburg, Jersey City, Newark, and other places in the vicinity.

Mortimer De Motte, Esq. in behalf of the American and Foreign Christian Union, under whose auspices, and by whose efforts, the Meeting was convened, read the following Call, together with the names of the gentlemen subscribed.

### THE CALL.

The undersigned would respectfully invite their fellow-citizens to a Public Meeting, to be held in the Tabernacle on THURSDAY EVENING, the 26th instant, for the purpose of adopting such measures as may then be deemed proper to secure the influence of our National Government

in the promotion of the principles of Religious Freedom, and especially in the protection of American citizens in the enjoyment of their rights of conscience and of religious worship, and to bury their dead in such way, and with such rites, as to them may seem most appropriate, when sojourning or traveling in foreign lands.

The enjoyment of these rights is fully granted and completely guaranteed to people of all nations, who, on account of business or pleasure, visit our country, and the reciprocation of them on the part of others toward our citizens ought no longer to be withheld.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| A. R. Wetmore, | T. Tileston, | Alexander Stuart, |
| William Colgate, | Peter Lorillard, | David Olyphant, |
| C. R. Robert, | William Douglass, | R. M. Olyphant, |
| Francis Hall, | William B. Crosby, | Wm. B. Astor, |
| James Harper, | Mortimer DeMotte, | Stewart Brown, |
| Peter Cooper, | Shepherd Knapp, | G. B. Lamar, |
| Horace Holden, | Benj. B. Sherman, | A. Norrie, |
| Thomas H. Faile, | Robert C. Goodhue, | Hiram Ketchum, |
| Stephen Whitney, | James Brown, | Moses Taylor, |
| James Donaldson, | A. P. Halsey, | C. V. S. Roosevelt, |
| Walter Lowrie, | Henry C. Bowen, | D. Leavitt, |
| Edmund Penfold, | G. Wood, | J. Oothout, |
| P. Perit, | Wm. E. Dodge, | J. Boorman, |
| R. W. Weston, | Anson G. Phelps, | Joseph Sampson, |
| John C. Green, | Gerard Hallock, | George Griswold, Jr. |
| James Lenox, | Robert L. Stuart, | |

The Hon. George Wood was chosen President of the Meeting.

The following gentlemen were nominated as Vice-Presidents and Secretaries.

VICE-PRESIDENTS.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| A. P. Halsey, | Hon. Theo. Frelinghuysen, | J. Donaldson, |
| James Brown, | Horace Holden, | Wm. Douglass, |
| Robert L. Stuart, | M. Van Schaick, | A. R. Wetmore, |
| Wm. Colgate, | Pelatiah Perit, | C. V. S. Roosevelt, |
| Peter Cooper, | C. R. Robert, | Wm. W. Stone, |
| James Boorman, | Joseph Sampson, | James Lennox, |
| Shepherd Knapp, | W. B. Astor, | Peter Lorillard, |
| Wm. B. Crosby, | George Douglass, | Gerard Hallock, |
| Thos. Tileston, | James Harper, | G. C. Verplanck, |
| Stephen Whitney, | Hon. Chief Justice Hornblower, | David Olyphant, |
| Wm. E. Dodge, | | Thomas B. Stillman. |

SECRETARIES.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| M. De Motte, | Rev. Dr. Stevens, | Edward Vernon, |
| Prof. H. Crosby, | John W. Corson, M. D. | F. Frelinghuysen. |

These nominations were unanimously confirmed.

Hon. George Wood, on assuming the Chair, spoke as follows:

*Fellow Citizens*—The objects of the meeting have already been sufficiently stated in the proposition of its Call, which has just been read to you. You will be addressed by a number of gentlemen who will speak upon the subjects appertaining to this important matter, in whose remarks they will be fully explained, and it will be unnecessary for me to delay you with any observations of mine. Perhaps, however, I may say with safety that if there be any people in the world who have a right to call for the exercise and indulgence of religious freedom in foreign lands, it is the people of the United States. You cannot walk in any of the public streets of this city without seeing the evidence of that liberality which we extend to nations abroad. Their people come here for the purposes of business or recreation, and for all of those objects which induce individuals from other countries to visit foreign lands. You hear almost all languages of Europe spoken in our streets, and they have full liberty to engage in all branches of commerce and the arts; and they have equally the privilege of worshipping their God according to the dictates of their own conscience, without any restriction whatever; and we think that the people of this country ought to receive similar privileges among those nations that derive these important benefits in our own country. We wish to bring this subject before the people at large, that they may memorialize Congress, that the subject may receive that attention from our Government which its importance deserves; and we trust that we have, at this time, arrived at that station of respectability and importance among the different nations of the earth, to entitle our Government, when they make a call of this kind upon the different nations of the earth, to have that call respected, and carried into effect. I have now stated the general purposes of this meeting, which will be opened with a prayer by Rev. Dr. Beecher, of the Baptist Church.

Rev. Dr. Beecher, of the Baptist Church, formerly of Albany, and now of New-York, opened the proceedings with prayer.

The Rev. Dr. Baird, one of the Secretaries of the American and Foreign Christian Union, then read the following Statement of Facts, which sets forth the reasons for calling the meeting.

## THE STATEMENT.

It will be expected that the reasons for calling this meeting should be set forth at the outset. This expectation is both legitimate and proper. We shall endeavor to satisfy it by presenting a very simple and brief statement.

The vast expansion of the commerce of our country, and the great aug-

mentation of the facilities of travel, have combined within the last few years to induce many of our fellow-citizens to go abroad for business or for pleasure; and every successive year in increasing numbers. It will not be going too far to affirm that many thousands of Americans are to be found every year residing or traveling in foreign lands.

In some of these countries there are very great obstacles in the way of their enjoying the rights of Conscience and Religious worship. In some, they cannot enjoy those rights at all. In some countries they are exposed to insult and injury if they do not comply with observances in the streets that are repugnant to their conscientious convictions. And in some they find it almost, if not quite, impossible to have their dead buried with such rites as they deem most Christian and most consonant with their feelings.

The limits of this document will not allow much detail; nevertheless, we must submit a few facts.

I. In our immediate vicinity lies the Island of Cuba, in whose ports hundreds and thousands of American mariners are annually to be seen, and to whose Cities and Plantations hundreds of our merchants and invalid citizens annually resort, in the prosecution of business or in quest of health. Many go thither to die! And yet, to this day, there is neither an American Protestant Chapel nor Chaplain for the spiritual instruction and care of our seamen and others of our countrymen, or for their guidance and consolation in the most fearful of all hours—the hour of death!—far from their homes and their friends! When the attempt was made a few years ago by the American Seamen's Friend Society to have Protestant religious services conducted aboard American ships at Havana, the Chaplain was compelled to desist, because it was not only required that he should "domiciliate" and take the oath of allegiance to the Queen of Spain, but also that he should swear that he was a good "Catholic." As these words signify a "Roman Catholic" in that land, no conscientious Protestant could or would take the oath. The same statement holds good of Porto Rico, the other principal Spanish island in the West Indies.

There is no American Protestant Chapel or service in Mexico, so far as we can learn, and it is believed that it would be difficult, if not impossible, to establish one. In some countries in South America, as well as in Central America, there would be difficulties to encounter; yet they would be far less formidable, it is believed, than in Mexico and Cuba.

In Italy itself, the central country of Christendom, with the exception of the kingdom of Sardinia, no religious service could be held by an American Protestant minister for the benefit of his countrymen, unless in the house of a diplomatic or consular agent, beneath the American flag, and as it were on American ground. This is so even in Rome, the Capital of the Christian World, as some vauntingly claim. Although the Roman Catholic Church

is permitted to enjoy in these United States, (seven-eighths at least of whose inhabitants are Protestants,) all the rights and privileges that any Protestant Church does, yet American Protestants are denied the right to have a church in Rome, or even a chapel, unless under the precarious condition of enjoying the patronage of, and in connection with, the American Embassy.

Nor is the state of things in Spain or in Austria more favorable than in Italy; in fact it is less so. Whilst in Portugal, according to the new Penal Code, promulgated on the 10th of December, 1852, the "celebrating of public acts of worship not that of the Catholic religion" is punishable with imprisonment of from one to three years, and to a fine proportioned to the income of the transgressor of the law! It is obvious that a Protestant church or chapel, even for foreigners, could not be opened in the Portuguese dominions since this law went into effect, without incurring the most serious risk. And all this is done in the middle of the XIXth century, and by a nation which owes its very existence at this day to Protestant England!

II. American Protestants are exposed to insult and serious mal-treatment in Mexico, Central America, all South America, Cuba, Porto Rico, Spain and Portugal, nearly all of Italy and Austria, if when they meet a procession, with a priest at its head, carrying the "Host," they do not render what are there considered to be acts of adoration, but which they conscientiously deem to be idolatrous and contrary to the Word of God. Every year the truth of this assertion is confirmed by disgraceful outrages, in word or deed, perpetrated in those countries.

III. As to the burial of their dead, American Protestants find very serious difficulties in several of the countries just named. Until very recently—nor are we sure that it is not so still—they would have been compelled to carry the bodies of their deceased friends from Madrid, the capital of Spain, to Malaga, Gibraltar, or Lisbon, to find a burial for them. English Protestants were subject to the same shameful indignities. Even within the last few months, Lord Howden, the British Ambassador at the Court of Spain, has been in earnest correspondence with the Spanish Government, in relation to the right of English Protestants, not merely to have at Madrid a cemetery, (which at length they are permitted to possess,) but also to have the bodies of their deceased friends carried to the grave in a hearse, and proper religious ceremonies performed in the cemetery, at the interment. There is a report that he has succeeded, but we are not sure of it.

In many places in Italy, American Protestants are subject to much inconvenience in being required to bury their dead at very unseasonable hours. In some countries, through fear of violence, they are compelled to bury their dead in a stealthly manner, and almost as unceremoniously as they would a brute beast.

A few years ago, a highly respectable American merchant (of a neighboring city) was compelled to dig a grave with his own hands, in an obscure spot, near one of the cities of Cuba, at the hour of midnight, for the burial of his beloved wife, whom he had taken to that island for the restoration of her health. By the influence of much persuasion, he succeeded in getting some assistance in his mournful enterprise from one or two negroes, who were in great fear, all the while, for their lives, lest it should become known that they had assisted at the burial of a heretic!

On all these subjects, we hold it to be the duty of the American government to negociate for, and secure by treaty, the rights of all its citizens, whether of native or foreign origin, in all countries where these rights are not fully recognized. This duty has been acknowledged, and to some degree fulfilled, by our Government from its commencement. As early as 1783, the religious rights of American citizens were guaranteed by Sweden, in a treaty made that year with the Government of the United States. From time to time—under the administrations of Washington, Jefferson, and their successors—something was done in regard to other countries. We are happy to say that at present we are not aware that there is a Protestant country where an American citizen, whether Protestant or Roman Catholic, is not permitted to enjoy his rights in relation to the subjects which have been specified. During the last administration, more was done than in any preceding one, with, perhaps, the exception of those of the second Adams and General Jackson, in this respect; for negociations were instituted by it with some of the governments of South America, (particularly the Oriental Republic of Uruguay and the Argentine Confederation,) which terminated favorably.

To encourage and sustain the Government in the farther prosecution of this great work, is one of the objects of this meeting.

Why should not the Government protect our citizens when abroad in the enjoyment of their religious as well as their civil and political rights? Are the latter more important than the former? Or is not the converse of this proposition true? We thank God that the day has come when we may say, almost in the noble language of the President in his Inaugural, that no American citizen can wander to any point on the globe where the strong arm of the Government shall not be stretched out to protect him. It is time that this shall be as true of his religious as of his political interests.

We hold, too, that the man who goes to distant lands to spread abroad the knowledge of the Gospel—whether by the distribution of the Sacred Scriptures and other religious books, or by proclaiming the way of salvation *viva voce*—must not be considered as having expatriated himself, or put himself beyond the pale of the protecting care of the Government, any more than the merchant who goes abroad for his business, but is to be protected in his work by the powerful arm of the State, so long as he does nothing con-

trary to the laws of the countries to which he goes. Thus far we may go with confidence. Nothing short of this—no opposition or violence, created by unrelenting Bigotry or blind Prejudice—should be allowed to drive an American Christian missionary from his field.

This was the ground that was taken by Mr. Webster in 1841 (when Secretary of State under Mr. Tyler's administration) in his letter to Commodore Porter, (then the American Chargé d'Affaires at Constantinople,) respecting the American missionaries laboring in Turkey. This ground, if we mistake not, the overwhelming majority of this nation are prepared to take and defend. The spirit of nationality which would not allow a hair of the head of Martin Kostza to be touched, simply because he had taken measures to become an American citizen, and had put himself under the care of the Government, and was doing nothing contrary to the laws of Turkey, will not long allow an American Christian Missionary to suffer in a foreign land, or be ignobly thrust out of it, so long as he does nothing contrary to the laws of that country.

Nor can we forbear to say that we think that the time has come when the Governments of these United States and Great Britain, and all other Christian nations which enjoy the blessings of religious liberty, and know its inestimable advantages, should combine their efforts for the purpose of hastening its universal prevalence in the world. It is certainly not less a legitimate subject for solemn negociation and the formal stipulations of international treaty than many subjects that concern humanity for which such interference has been secured.* It can be shown that intolerance on the subject of religion has been the cause of the most bitter animosities, the most unnatural separations, and many of the bloodiest and longest-continued wars of which the world has ever been the theatre. It has often arrayed against each other, in the most cruel strife, those who profess the same religious belief, but differ in regard to unimportant shades of opinion in doctrine or modes of worship. What deplorable conflicts have taken place between Protestant and Roman Catholic nations, and between Roman Catholics and the Greek and other Oriental Christians! Even within the very walls of the church at Jerusalem, which incloses the reputed sepulchre of our Lord, they have fought in the most barbarous manner, and that in the presence of their common enemy, the Mussulman! It is time that this disgrace should be removed forever from the escutcheon of Christendom. The Christian nations owe it to Him whose sacred name they

* The African Slave Trade and Piracy are scarcely more important subjects for such negotiation. Nor have instances been wanting of the interference to which we have referred in the text. Had it not been for the efforts and earnest remonstrances of England (during the Protectorate of Cromwell, the reigns of William and Mary, and Queen Anne,) and those of Holland, Sweden and the Protestant Cantons of Switzerland in the 17th and 18th centuries, the Waldenses would have been annihilated.

bear, (and whose religion, as preached by Himself, is so well calculated, as it was unquestionably designed, to promote "peace on earth and good will among men,") to cause it to be removed.

In vain do men search for one sentence in all His discourses or precepts to justify either persecution or intolerance in matters of religion. And it can be demonstrated that the manifestation of the spirit of forbearance and tolerance where diversity of religious belief exists, is as conducive to the welfare of communities and even of nations, as it is of individuals. And it is the duty of Governments—especially Christian Governments—to cause such forbearance and tolerance,—in other and better words, *religious liberty*, —to be maintained and respected. It would seem as if the day ought by this time to have arrived when no man shall suffer death, or be in any way oppressed or interfered with, in regard to his religious convictions, and the proper manifestation of them.

We are happy to believe that the views which we have expressed have often been shared by the distinguished men to whose hands the administration of our government has from time to time been delegated. In the year 1825, the Governments of Mexico, Central America, and Coombia resolved to hold a Congress at the Isthmus of Panama, at which each of them should be represented, "to deliberate upon objects important to the welfare of all." * Our Government was invited to send representatives to that Congress. The distinguished man who then occupied the Presidential chair (the late John Quincy Adams) accepted the invitation, and nominated for that mission two distinguished citizens, one of whom was the late Hon. John Sergeant, of Philadelphia. It is known that one great object which the President had much at heart, in relation to that Congress, was to endeavor to induce the South American Republics to come to right ground in regard to the principles of religious liberty—believing it to be essential to their true prosperity and happiness. It is believed that Mr. Adams lost no suitable opportunity, during his administration, of kindly calling the attention of these Governments to this great subject. His sentiments on the importance of religious liberty were fully shared by two illustrious citizens, now no more —Dewitt Clinton and Henry Clay—both ardent friends of the South American Republics.

Our Government seconded the efforts of England to persuade the Porte to grant religious liberty, or a large measure of it, to its Christian subjects. Why should not the same thing be done in the case of some governments which are called Christian—some of them Roman Catholic, some Protestant, and one of them of the Greek Church—but whose intolerance is a dishonor to the name of Christ? At all events, let our Government ever be ready,

* First Annual Message of John Quincy Adams.

by kind negotiation—by unofficial exertion, if nothing more can be done—to lend the weight of its moral influence, whenever it is needed, to the promotion of this great interest. Our Government grants religious liberty to all who come to this happy land. It has a right to expect to be heard when it approaches other nations on this subject, and respectfully urges them to try what we have found to be so great a blessing.

Facts are not wanting to prove that such an intervention is not likely to be made in vain. A short letter from Mr. Webster, (when Secretary of State, under Mr. Tyler's administration,) to a Consular Agent in the East exerted a happy influence on the Pacha of Damascus, who had allowed the Jews of that city to suffer an almost exterminating persecution. A brief inquiry, certainly not containing five sentences, addressed by Mr. Forsyth, (Secretary of State during Mr. Van Buren's administration.) to the American Consul at Hamburg, produced an excellent effect upon the Senate of that city, in relation to the persecution which the Baptists were there enduring. A letter from Mr. Barnard to the Government of Prussia, some eighteen months ago, had a happy effect in the case of the Rev. Mr. Oncken and the Baptist brethren in that kingdom. Nor can we doubt that the letter of Mr. Everett, a year ago, (whilst Secretary of State, during Mr. Fillmore's administration,) to the Grand Duke of Tuscany, had some influence on the case of the Madiai.

Such an influence we would see our Government ready to exert, whenever there is need of it,—in Protestant countries in favor of persecuted or oppressed Roman Catholics, just as promptly and as earnestly as in Roman Catholic countries in favor of persecuted or oppressed Protestants; and in both Protestant and Roman Catholic countries, when there is need, in behalf of the injured and oppressed Israelite.

Such are some of the considerations which have led to the calling of this meeting. The Board of Directors of the American and Foreign Christian Union—a Society which embraces good men of almost every branch of the Protestant Church in our country—have felt it to be their duty, inasmuch as the promotion of religious liberty is one of the great objects for which it was organized, to invite their fellow citizens to unite with them in an attempt to call the attention of the Public and of the Government to this great subject. Nor can they believe that (with the blessing of Heaven) it will be in vain.

## LETTERS IN REPLY TO INVITATIONS.

The Rev. Dr. Fairchild, the other Corresponding Secretary of the American and Foreign Christian Union, next stated that interesting and important letters had been received from several distinguished

gentlemen who had been invited to attend the meeting, among whom he named the Honorable Messrs. Everett, Lawrence, Barnard, Wise, Schenck, McCurdy, Winthrop, and Jessup, of whom the first six have represented this Government at the Courts of Great Britain, Prussia, Brazil, and Austria. He also stated that the Rev. Dr. Durbin, who had been expected to address the meeting, was detained in Philadelphia by his official labors. Extracts from some of these letters were read by Dr. Fairchild. We here give several of them entire, and venture to express the desire that they may be read with attention; for they serve well to present in a striking light the importance of the object for whose promotion the meeting was called.

---

## Letter from Rev. Dr. Durbin.

Philadelphia, Tuesday, January 24th, 1854.

Rev. Dr. Baird.

My dear Sir.—It is now settled that I cannot be in New-York next Thursday evening, and of course cannot take part in your public meeting. I sincerely wish I could be there, and have the privilege of saying a few words in favor of religious liberty in all countries, and more particularly in favor of our own citizens enjoying, when residing or traveling in Papal countries, the religious liberty which our own country grants to the citizens or natives of other countries residing among us. For several years I have publicly, in the pulpit and by the press, advocated the propriety of taking measures, both as citizens and as a Government, to obtain religious liberty for our citizens from those Governments within whose limits they may reside or travel with the consent of said Government. I have ever thought that when a Government admits a person within its limits, it by that very act grants him the due exercise of his inalienable rights, and certainly among these are the rights of conscience in religious matters. I am satisfied that our Government ought to use all its legitimate influence to obtain these privileges for our citizens, and to have respect to this in all treaties to be made hereafter. There is good reason to believe, that if there was a general expression on the part of the people of this country in favor of the measure proposed, our Government would not only give attention to the matter, but would strenuously urge it on all suitable occasions, and with success.

I am, yours very respectfully,

J. P. Durbin.

## Letter from Hon. Abbott Lawrence.

Boston, Monday, January 9th, 1854.

Dear Sirs.—I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your note of invitation, to be present at a meeting of the members of the Society of the "American and Foreign Christian Union," on the 26th inst. for the purpose of calling the attention of the people, and especially the Government of the United States, to the serious disabilities under which Americans labor in some foreign countries, in consequence of not being allowed to worship God as Protestants, in accordance with the dictates of their consciences and their own views of duty. Besides, there are countries in Europe where it is found difficult, and in some cases almost impossible, for Protestants to bury their dead with those rites which are most in harmony with their convictions of Christian duty. It has appeared to me for several years past, that these two points were proper subjects for Executive consideration and diplomatic action.

The time has now arrived, in the middle of this Nineteenth Century, when such stains, which have been so long lamented as discreditable to the character of those countries, should be removed.

I cannot doubt that our Government will, without hesitation, give this subject the consideration which its importance demands; and that instructions will be transmitted to our Representatives abroad, of a character that will accomplish the object our citizens have so long desired. It may not be obtained at once; but the spirit of the age in which we live, it seems to me, must have the effect of producing changes in the civil and religious condition of several countries in Europe, which are now suffering under a spiritual and political despotism, so that one would suppose (even in the absence of the Bible) it cannot long survive the introduction of those lower but powerful agencies of the printing press, steam engine, and telegraph, coupled with the great and constantly augmenting intercourse of the nations of the earth.

I fully sympathize in the objects of your proposed meeting, and regret that it will not be in my power to unite personally in carrying forward the truly Christian purposes indicated in your note.

I have the honor to be, dear Sirs, very sincerely, your obedient servant.

Abbott Lawrence.

To Anson G. Phelps, John W. Corson, Mortimer De Motte, and William W. Stone, Esq. *Committee.*
Rev. R. Baird, D. D. and Rev. E. R. Fairchild, D. D. *Secretaries.*

## Letter from Hon. Edward Everett.

Washington, Friday, January 6th, 1854.

Gentlemen.—Your favor of the 29th of December reached me to-day. I regret that my engagements here will put it out of my power to attend the meeting in the Tabernacle on the 26th inst.

I concur with you in the opinion that it is the duty of the Executive Government, in its negotiations with foreign powers, to procure as far as possible for the citizens of the United States, traveling or residing abroad, liberty of conscience and freedom of religious worship. The customary law of nations secures these rights, to a certain extent, to a Minister Resident and his suite; and provision has been made by treaty in many cases to extend the same rights to his countrymen. There is room for great improvement in this respect, and the increasing enlightment of the age demands it. The United States, of all the powers of Christendom, ought to expect the most liberal treatment in this respect, in return for the religious equality guaranteed by the Constitution.

The right of Christian burial ought in all cases to be freely conceded. Common humanity requires this.

This subject has long since engaged the attention of the Government. A liberal provision for freedom of conscience and Christian burial was secured by our treaty with Sweden as early as 1783, and similar stipulations are contained in more recent treaties, particularly those with the Catholic States of South America. In 1826 Mr. Adams mentioned "just and liberal principles of religious liberty" as one of the objects to be promoted by the Congress at Panama.

I am happy to learn from you that the President and Secretary of State are believed to be favorable to the general object in view. Their influence, steadily and prudently exerted, will contribute materially to the desired end.

It must not be forgotten, however, that there is no subject on which Foreign States are more jealous than their religious belief and the rites and usages connected with it; and also that the discretionary power of all branches of our own Government is extremely limited in all that pertains to this subject.

I remain, gentlemen, with great respect, yours, very truly,

Edward Everett.

Messrs. Anson G. Phelps, W. W. Stone, Mortimer De Motte, J. W. Corson, Committee.
Drs. R. Baird, and E. R. Fairchild, Corresponding Secretaries.

---

## Letter from D. D. Barnard.

Albany, Tuesday Jan. 24, 1854.

Gentlemen.—I appreciate highly the honor you have done me in your urgent appeal to me to be present and take part in the meeting proposed

to be held at the Tabernacle, in New-York, on the 26th inst. by the American and Foreign Christian Union.

I regret to say that my engagements do not allow me to hope to be able to attend this meeting. I cannot, however, suffer the occasion to pass without declaring my hearty concurrence and sympathy with the views and objects of your Society in the proposed meeting, as they are explained to me in your letter.

To secure to American citizens traveling or residing abroad the right of Conscience and of Religious Worship, as a special object; and, as a broader and more general object, to promote the great principle of Religious Toleration and Freedom in those countries where it does not now exist, and with which we maintain Diplomatic relations—these are objects worthy, certainly, of grave consideration, and, I think, of earnest effort.

If the great principle of Religious Toleration can be secured, the whole object would be essentially gained. And, on the other hand, if American citizens can have the privilege of free worship, the performance of their own religious rites, and immunity from observances contrary to their consciences, accorded to them, general religious toleration could not long be withheld.

The Government of the United States may very properly interpose, in the way of diplomatic representations, for protection of American citizens abroad, in the quiet performance of their own religious worship and ceremonies, as well on ordinary occasions as in particular circumstances—for example, the burial of their dead.

When the question is one which concerns religious toleration in general, having no special regard to any complaints or any claims on the part of American citizens, then the matter would assume rather the form of intervention; but it would be an intervention justified by every just consideration of Christian principle and charity, and one easily divested of every offensive or objectionable feature, by observing a becoming modesty and deference in presenting it, and employing no other aguments or means than such as the great law of love and brotherhood, and the rules of good sense and of common courtesy and mutual respect between equal and friendly Powers would sanction.

I am persuaded that much might be effected with Governments abroad on this whole subject, with a proper demeanor on our part, and a proper use of the right means. We must not assume too much, nor demand too much, nor be too impatient at delays. Governments abroad are often much in advance of their people, in point both of intelligence and liberality on subjects of this character. They cannot always do what they would like to do. And sometimes, unhappily, our citizens abroad add to the embarrassments of the Governments in regard to measures of relief or reform, by unreflecting, injudicious, or fanatical proceedings or demonstrations in the

face of the public, unnecessarily shocking incurable prejudices, and rousing and inflaming popular hate and passion.

My confidence in the reasonable success of judicious and becoming measures and efforts for religious toleration in countries where it is now unknown, or nearly so, is based on personal observation abroad, and, in some degree, on personal experience. I had occasion, during my late residence abroad, to try the experiment, in an humble way, of a direct appeal to the sovereign of the country where I resided, in behalf of a portion of his own subjects, for protection against religious persecution. It is true, this was in a Protestant country, and the appeal was made to a Protestant and truly Christian King; but the intolerance complained of proceeded from the Established Church of the kingdom, of which the King was the recognized head, and which stood upon the laws of the kingdom as the ground and justification of its persecuting spirit. The kind manner in which this appeal was received, and the result have convinced me that efforts of the sort, made in the right temper, may be productive of much good. Even in countries where another and very jealous faith prevails, appeals, made in the spirit of a catholic charity, from this Protestant country, which aims to give an example of perfect toleration and complete protection to all religions, would not, I am confident, be altogether in vain.

I think, also, that the time is propitious. England has already done a great deal towards opening the way for a more enlightened and more tolerant sentiment and feeling on all this subject. The English Church has made a lodgment in almost every quarter of the European Continent. Everywhere it is a foreign establishment, maintained and supported as such, but is covered by the toleration and protection of the Governments where it is planted. And whether in Romish or Protestant countries—for both have been intolerant in their laws and in their prejudices and practices—the presence of the English Church, always orderly and inoffensive, by gradually accustoming the people and governments to a worship and service differing from the established forms, has tended to disarm prejudice and to give the impression that general toleration might be indulged both with propriety and safety.

It cannot be doubted, I think, that Europe has been and is making rapid progress in liberal and tolerant ideas, from whatever cause it may proceed. No observant person who may have visited Europe twenty years ago could visit it now without noticing the difference. And I think the time has fully come when the strongest encouragement is given to hope for signal success in such efforts as the Directors of the American and Foreign Christian Union now propose shall be made through the instrumentality and authority of the American Government, in connection perhaps with the English, and it may

be with other Governments, for promoting the triumph of the great cause of religious liberty in Europe.

I am, gentlemen, with high consideration and respect, your obedient servant, D. D. BARNARD.

Messrs. Anson G. Phelps, W. W. Stone, John W. Corson, E. R. Fairchild, R. Baird.

---

## Letter from Hon. Robert C. Winthrop.

Boston, Monday Jan. 23, 1854.

GENTLEMEN,—I am highly honored by your communication in behalf of the American and Foreign Christian Union, inviting me to address the meeting to be held at New-York, on the 26th inst. on the subject of *Religious Liberty*.

My engagements at home will not allow me to be present on the occasion; nor have I found opportunity for such an investigation of the particular topics suggested by you, as would enable me to furnish you, agreeably to your polite request, with any extended views on the subject.

Undoubtedly, grievances exist of a grave character, and which deserve the attention of our Government.

American citizens in foreign countries ought to be secure from any requisition to violate their conscientious convictions. They ought to be free to Worship God according to their own religious forms. And, certainly, they ought to be allowed to bury their dead with rites agreeable to their own feelings, and in places fit for such a purpose.

I sincerely trust, gentlemen, that your proceedings may be calculated to promote the accomplishment of these objects; and let me add my earnest hope, that the day may be hastened, when a true Religious Liberty may be enjoyed and secured, both at home and abroad, and when neither native nor foreigner, Protestant nor Catholic, upon our own soil or upon any other, shall be molested for his religious sentiments, or obstructed in his religious pursuits.

I am, with great respect and regard, your obliged and obedient servant,

ROBERT C. WINTHROP.

Messrs. Anson G. Phelps, John W. Corson, Mortimer De Motte, and William W. Stone, Committee.

Rev. Drs. Baird and E. R. Fairchild, Secretaries.

---

## From Hon. Henry A. Wise.

Only, near Onancock, Va. Saturday, Jan. 14, 1854.

GENTLEMEN,—Yours of the 27th ult. reached me here yesterday, *via* Richmond. It was forwarded thence by a friend, and this must account for

the delay in its reception. I regret very much that I cannot accept your very inviting call to attend the meeting which you propose to hold, the 26th inst. at the Broadway Tabernacle, in New-York, to bring properly before our Government the subject of securing, "by treaty, for our people when traveling or residing abroad, the unmolested enjoyment of their rights of conscience;—the right to have their own public worship where they desire it; and to bury their dead with such religious services and rites as they may desire," &c. And in addition to this, you say: "It is believed that it would be well to use the occasion to suggest the inquiry, whether the time has not come for the Government of the United States to lend at least the weight of its moral influence in behalf of religious liberty, in all countries where it does not exist, and with which the United States have diplomatic relations," &c. On these great subjects you invite me to go and speak at the proposed meeting, and, if I cannot comply with this request, you ask that "I will give you, by letter, my views on the subjects for the promotion of which the meeting is to be called, that you may avail yourselves of them at the meeting, and afterwards through the press." And you make this appeal to me because you suppose "the subject is not new to me"—that in the diplomatic post which I have occupied at the Court of Brazil "I must have had my attention often called to it."

This subject is *not* new to me, and none of the public questions, of present moment, are of more importance and of more interest than this, in my humble opinion. The individual instances which could be cited in connection with it, would appear, perhaps, to be personal and minor matters as compared with others of great public concern; but a full consideration of this subject opens a universal field of world-reform, as large, I venture to say, as any other which could be named. Indeed, practical success, in this moral and political enterprise, will at once reach many of the best results aimed at by the missionary of the Cross of Christ, by the men of science and discoverers of the earth, and by the arts and aims of life.

At a time like this, too, when the Bible's rays, and the students' lamps, and the ships' binnacles are illuminating and pointing the ways of knowledge, and lightning and steam are propelling progress everywhere, and in an age when there is *gold*, *gold*, *gold* enough and to spare to pay every laborer his hire in every good work of "good will to men," and when "peace on earth" has become the policy of every civilized nation; it is not to be tolerated that ignorance, and bigotry, and superstition, and barbarity and brute force, here, there, and almost everywhere, in some of the very fairest fields of human exertion, where much of man's highest excellence could be most easily attained, should be allowed, like serpents in Paradise, to corrupt our nature, shut out the light, hinder the progress of civilization, and arrest every step of humanity towards either mental, moral, or physical improve-

ment. We may surely arm ourselves *in the armor of righteousness* against such evil ones on earth as these.

Your own allusions, gentlemen, must be blamed, if I indulge in any egotism, by saying that when I entered upon the duties of the Mission to the Court of Brazil, I found the labors of one of my predecessors especially illustrated by the archives of the Legation. He was dead, but the good which he did was not all "interred with his bones." I was made by his works in that Mission to inquire feelingly for the remains of the laborious, the learned, the successful negotiator, Mr. Tudor. He died in Rio de Janeiro whilst Chargé of the United States of North America, the greatest Republic in the world, at the Court of Don Pedro I., and after he had negotiated our treaty of amity and commerce with that Empire. *The only sanctuary his corpse had found was a hospitable grave in the burying-ground which Great Britain had secured safe for heretics*, her subjects, in a land broad enough surely for men of all persuasions to die in! The Sabbath came, and I heard the bells chiming for church. Where were I and my family and American friends to attend Divine worship? *There was no ground consecrated there for us.* We were reminded on the Lord's day of our homes in our own blessed, happy land of universal tolerance in religion; but there, in a land of *commercial* friends by treaty, we had no *religious allies*, and were indeed "strangers in a strange land,"—*their* God *was our* God, but their *country* was *not our country to worship in.* We were compelled to go to our closets to pray, if we did not accept the hospitality again of English subjects, to kneel with them in their temple which their maternal Government had caused to be erected for their special privilege. Thus for the grave and the altar we were indebted to our mother country, and not to our own.

And here I cannot forbear to pay a just tribute to Great Britain for her care of her subjects abroad. However high her hand against other nations, however strong and unyielding her grasp of dominion over other people, she careth for *her own* at home, and to "the uttermost parts of the earth." Her "drum-beat" is heard everywhere, and wherever it is heard it is a sound of *protection to her little ones*—however feeble and however distant they may be from her central power. It is better for the barbarians of any tribe that a millstone were hung about their necks than for them to hurt one of Great Britain's protegés. They are heretics, as well as we; and they have their sanctuary and their grave-yards where the hyenas dare not howl. And it is due alike to her subjects to say that, in Brazil, they were hospitable to us, and gave us the use of both their holy places—the temple and the burying-ground. But ought we to have been beholden to any Government but our own for common rights of humanity like these?

I mean not to boast, but the Department of State can show how, when the American ships engaged in the charters of the infamous Slave trade dis-

charged their American crews, or drove them from shipboard by the worst of mal-usage, in order to avoid their being the witnesses of the traffic, and left them friendless and penniless all along the coast of South America, to encounter every brutality to which a forlorn sailor is subject in foreign ports; how when a Frothingham, of Boston, was knocked down in the streets of Rio de Janeiro, or a Southworth, of New-York, was imprisoned, or Clark, a sailor of New-York, was beaten; I never failed to interpose in any and every way to make our citizens abroad, assured that they had a protecting power over them, and to make foreign governments feel that we, too, as well as Great Britain, *took care of our own*. Great Britain not only supplied her Minister and Consul and men-of-war with the means of relief and the power of protection, but I may say here that I, as Minister of the United States, was more than once allowed the use of the British Consular seal, in affording personal protection to our citizens. And, finally, when for attempting to protect a poor seaman of our naval service, Mr. Davis, of Delaware, a Lieutenant of the Navy, was forcibly seized and imprisoned in the City Palace at Rio de Janeiro, I demanded his instant release; and here I may say, too, that in that demand I was supported firmly by as brave a squadron of our Navy, though small, as ever Hull or Decatur or Perry commanded. In one difficulty, the lamented Captain Turner, and in the last Captain Rousseau, were ready to stand by their flag and their Minister as long as there was "a shot in the locker." This is worthy to be mentioned to their honor, at a time when our popular sympathies are heartily offering medals to the gallant Ingraham for his timely interposition of late in favor of American protection in the Old World. At the time alluded to, we had in the harbor of Rio the frigate *Columbia*, and the little brig *Bainbridge*, and previously the frigate *Raritan*, and the same brig. On one occasion, when the Minister of Justice, Senr. Galvon, had sent a number of armed open boats, without notice to me or his own Minister of Foreign Affairs, that he was about to attempt by force what ought to have been accomplished by negotiation, I was appealed to by the Minister of Foreign Affairs to yield a question of extradition. I replied that I could do nothing *per minas*,—I would be silent as long as the arm of force was uplifted. "What will you do, sir?" said he. "Wait for your movements, sir!" was my reply. "Would you resist in our own harbor?" "You must risk the Paixhan shot of that, sir!" said I. He entreated then that I would go with him to see Senr. Galvon, the Minister of Justice. I replied, "I am accredited to your Emperor, sir." But he prevailed on me to accompany him, *as a friend*, to the house of his colleague in the Ministry. There I soon had occasion to say to the Minister of Justice, that I could not discuss the question with him. "Sir," said he, "suppose I had two frigates instead of one,—would your Commodore then presume to disregard the Imperial decrees?" "Sir," said I, "you have one frigate, two sloops-of-war, and a brig

in your harbor, and you have the forts Santa Cruz, Larges, Villagenon, and Isla Cobras, and one hundred water line guns,—is not that force enough against one frigate and one small brig?" "Sir," said he, "will your Commodore obey a writ of *habeas corpus?*" "Are you, sir," said I, "the Minister of Public Justice, and ask that question? Don't you know that the deck of a man-of-war of the United States is as the *terra firma* of my country, and that your process of law cannot go into that jurisdiction?" "Sir," said he, "if I could I would send a writ of *habeas corpus* to Heaven!" I told him that "I wished he could, and I would be an humble petitioner to be his Sheriff, Marshal, or Messenger to take his writ there; and I assured him that in case I did so, it would be the same with me as it would be with his messenger sent to our Commodore—*I would never come back to him!*" With that reply he was put into the best of humors—his sides shook with laughter "like a bowl full of jelly;" he rang his bell, ordered some *doces* (sweetmeats) and wine, and wound up by saying—"Well, sir, we will peaceably settle this affair, as I see that force will not do." "You can't negotiate with me sir, until you withdraw your armed forces," I replied; and that he ordered immediately. I then said to him that it was well affairs were about to take a peaceable turn; that our citizens had individually suffered the most odious oppressions, and they could be submitted to no longer; that my own son, (now Secretary of Legation at Berlin,) had just been wantonly assaulted in the streets and wounded on the head and the arms, simply for being a foreigner, and the child was present to exhibit the wounds; that had force been resorted to by him, the reprisals would have been severe. He immediately called in an officer of their Permanentes—their armed police—and asked me to let him have the person of my son at his command for a few hours. I consented at once, though the youth was then only about fifteen years of age. He was caused alone to walk, pass and repass alone for some hours about the place where he had been assaulted, while the Permanentes kept guard in the back-ground, ready to arrest the person who would probably assail again. The ruse failed, but I inquired of the Minister what would have been done with the culprit had he been arrested? "He would, sir, have been punished to your satisfaction—even unto death, had you required it." I replied that I was happy, then, the criminal had escaped detection. But from that moment a new era commenced in Rio de Janeiro of safety to American citizens. I may proudly say, and appeal to all who are informed on the subject, that American protection has been worth more in the three millions of square miles of that part of the globe than it was ever worth before. I threw the American flag over every person and every right that I could possibly or reasonably make it cover. It grew broader and broader in its folds, to my mind, every day that I studied more and more the laws of nations and rights of humanity. I made it the badge of my equipage, of

my family, and my only coat of arms; and our own rights and our own persons were made sacred under its protection. When Stephenson's regiment arrived from the United States for California, Sergeant Harris and his wife, an Irish woman, came in one of the transports, and had a female child born on the high seas. The officers of the *Preble* presented the babe with a silver cup, and christened the child Alta California Harris. They applied to me, the Minister of the United States, to stand godfather for that child at its christening. It was at a time when the Empress was just delivered of a young Princess, and the city had been illuminated, and every foreign man-of-war, except the *Columbia* and *Bainbridge*, had saluted the event. They declined to salute and I to illuminate, because Mr. Davis had been imprisoned. But when it was proposed to christen *one of our children*, to salute her with a national greeting, and I was asked to stand father to this American soldier's child, born in the service of his country, I leaped to the ceremony as no plaything, as nothing idle and unmeaning and childish, but as to the prompting of a passion—as to a patriotic duty full of example—*that we would take care of the least of our little ones too, all over the earth, and on the high seas!* I did take the vows before our Chaplain on the deck of the *Columbia*, and such guns and such cheers were hardly ever heard to "rattle among the crags" of the Corcovado and the Tejuca and the Pan de Assucar before! The meaning of it was: "*The United States will protect her citizens in their lawful rights the world over, and they shall have all the rights of the most favored sons of men?*"

I will, indeed, say here what I have never said publicly before; that if Lieutenant Davis had not been released, I would have demanded that Commodore Rousseau should have released him by force. His officers and crew were as patriotic and devoted as Decatur's at Tripoli. Had a shot been fired, I would have gone on board the *Columbia* and shared her fate. We would have stormed Isla de Cobras, the nearest battery to the town, and turned its guns upon the palace of the Emperor. We would, God willing, have razed that palace and taken the Emperor himself and brought him home to the United States, to be no otherwise tortured than to bring him here and show him the real form and comeliness of *Civil Liberty* and *universal tolerance*, and then to send him back in safety to his own dominion, there to be the best missionary of American protection that could be sent to all South America, where protection, personal protection to American citizens—is so much needed!

This may seem like badinage now to you, but I tell you that it would have been an earnest enterprise, and as easy as it is for one North American of the United States' race of men, of the blood of the English and Scotch and Irish and Germans, to subdue ten of the Spanish or Portuguese race anywhere upon earth, even at the doors of their own homesteads, as is proved

by all the battles of the late Mexican campaigns. And, so far as South America is concerned, all that our Government has to do, is *to assert firmly this right of protection, and to convince them that we are in earnest in our demands, and there will never be any necessity to resort to force.* Indeed, wherever this protection is wanting, there is an inherent weakness in the nation which withholds or denies it. They are weak from ignorance, and wanting in all the elements of national strength. Such powers as England and the United States, by a wise coöperation in international policy, on subjects like this, could in another quarter of a century subdue all opposition to this potent means of making a common brotherhood among mankind. Therefore it is, that I for one have heartily rejoiced at every expedition fitted out by any of the larger and enlightened powers to such countries as that of Japan. A short sighted view of the war of Great Britain upon China would condemn it as immoral and unjust, and her East India conquests would seem to be mere and sheer desolations; but I am consoled for almost all British aggressions everywhere, except on the continents of the two Americas, and her oppression of Ireland, by the civilizing results which follow the march of her triumphs. Everywhere, under British laws, personal protection to our citizens is safe and sure, and I am willing for those laws to reign everywhere else than where the dominion justly belongs to ourselves, and the spirit of those laws we ourselves adopt. And whence came that spirit? How is it imbued? By nothing less divine than the faith and practice of Christianity itself. Christianity alone can make a brotherhood among men, and we need not expect these ameliorations from any other people than a people who have *homes*, who have altars of baptism, who have consciences enlightened by the Lord's Prayer and the Decalogue, and by the Sermon on the Mount, and who are strong enough in moral power, thence derived, to give laws to the world by a word, without a blow!

When you come in contact with the Despotisms of the Old World, on this subject, you meet with something much more obdurate even than the ignorance and weakness of the South American and Mexican States. In Turkey, "protection for the fanes" may be claimed and enforced, for Turkey is a weak barbarism, a dying dynasty. But the dynasties of Russia and Austria and Italy and France and Prussia, are comparatively strong, and strong enough yet awhile to "kick against the pricks!" To cite to them the examples of English and American liberty, is at once to excite their alarm. These examples are angels of light which must not enter their dark dominions. Russia is waging war upon Turkey for the privileges of conscience, for the rites of a Greek Church; and, yet, go to Russia to establish a law of *Magna Charta* and you would be in danger of the knout! Ask her to give the personal protection in her country to one of our citizens residing or traveling there, which we give to one of her citizens residing, or traveling

here, and your request would be judged a seditious appeal to a revolution of her Government—an attempt at dethronement of her Despotism. Therefore it was, that I instinctively rejoiced at the decisive step taken by Capt. Ingraham in the case of Koszta. As Mr. Polk's Administration had sustained, nobly sustained, my mission in every claim of American protection which I had set up in Brazil for our citizens, and *all* American *rights as well as the rights of citizenship* to protection, I looked with anxiety to see what would be the action of our State Department upon the affair at Smyrna. Mr. Marcy's State paper soon relieved me. It was able and fully up to the occasion. And here let me say that it has not been fully or fairly understood, either in the country, or, (it seems from late debates,) in Congress. He pleaded *not* the defence of Captain Ingraham upon Koszta's rights *as a citizen*, nor can it be based upon the less perfect rights of him *as a man*. Mr. Marcy took the ground which can be and has been sustained, that *though he did not have the rights of American citizenship, yet he had other American rights:*—That protection was due and might well be given to *something short of citizenship;*—That interposition was not merely in such a case a good office, to be rendered or not at discretion; but it was *a perfect obligation of duty which had to be discharged in an imperative* sense. Oppression had driven the victim away from his own country, an exile and an outlaw. His oppressors had deprived him of protection, and yet proclaimed his allegiance. In their own jurisdiction they might have pursued him unto death. But he fled, escaped their jurisdiction, and came to our asylum, and he took the oath that *he would become* one of our citizens—that *he would owe us allegiance, do us duty as a freeman, obey our laws, and fight for our flag. This gave him an American right to become a citizen of the United States.* It was a *positive* right under our Naturalization Laws. Again, in the mean time, he went abroad. This he had a positive right to do, everywhere else than in Austrian dominions; and from everywhere else, except Austria, *he had a right to return to the United States, here to be naturalized and here to enjoy civil liberty.* He did not go to Austria, but was seized in another jurisdiction, where Austria had no legal sway, but where the sovereignty was too weak to protect him. To whom was he to appeal, and how? As *a man* only? Then it was an affair of *any* power who *would*, or of *no* power who would *not* interpose in his behalf. He had vague and undefined and imperfect rights only, and there was no conclusive duty of protection anywhere. But he had *a perfect right*, already partly legalized and inchoate, *to become* an *American citizen;* he had a perfect right *to return to America* as his asylum and home, and a perfect right already commenced, *here to enjoy civil liberty;* and *all those rights were invaded* by Austria, *out of her jurisdiction*, "where there was no eye to pity and no hand to save, unless *American power* was

there to protect these *American rights.* The *American power was there, and it did interpose;* and Amen, Amen say I!!

And this doctrine is not new under the sun. It is but a new phase of things as old as 1776 and 1812. During the Revolution, George III. had much better reason for hanging Whigs as traitors in these colonies, than Austria had to seize Koszta in Turkish dominions. At that period, Great Britain held to the maxim of tyranny—"Once a citizen, always a citizen." Yes! She, too, denied the right of forswearing allegiance, or the right of expatriation. She held that a man born a serf must grow up and remain a serf for all life-time—that he might cross the seas, and still be in the thraldom of his nativity; that he might cross mountains and lakes and rivers and continents, and still "but drag a lengthening chain,"—that he might "take the wings of the morning and fly to the uttermost parts of the earth,"—and yet there, upon sea or land, she would have the right to seize him for allegiance due to her; and if he had forsworn that allegiance, and bound himself to revolutions of resistance to her sovereignty, she might lawfully hang him for treason. She did hang some of the best American patriots under this execrable doctrine, until the American armies took and held hostages of retaliation against its enforcement. Nothing more strongly aroused the spirit of resistance than the practice of this maxim—"Once a citizen, always a citizen." Again, the policy of our Government, almost in the midst of arms, became at once to settle our vast public domain. As if by magic, as coming from inspiration, came that wisest of all our institutions, next to the Constitution of the United States, the great Land Ordinance of 1787. Before it, fell every feudal castle of old time. It had no prototype. It was unique and unexampled. By the simplest provisions of law, by East and West, North and South lines, *homes* were made for our people, almost without money and without price, and free from all litigation and strife about boundaries or titles, and we said to the oppressed and poor of all nations—"*Ho! come and settle down to your rest—here is a vine and here is a fig tree!*" Immigration was thus called, and the nations began to come, and they have not ceased to come! And the Constitution of our land was the first, in conjunction with this ordinance, to provide that Congress "*shall have power to establish an uniform rule of Naturalization.*" This was the first organic movement against the maxim of tyrants—"Once a citizen, always a citizen." The Land laws bade the people come, and this commanded that they should be *naturalized*—that they should have the right of expatriation—that they should not *always* be slaves—that they should have a legal way to be free, and that in their freedom they should find the protection of American laws. The Naturalization Act of 1802 was passed, and in seven years thereafter the *Leopard* attacked the American flag again on board the *Chesapeake*, under the claim to impress English seamen in our service by force of the maxim—"Once a citizen,

always a citizen." Protection was assailed, also, in our neutral rights of commerce, and at last after a hard struggle, the second war with Great Britain was declared for "free trade and sailors' rights." This meant nothing else and nothing less than that the United States would protect *their people*, born wherever they might have been born, at home and abroad, on the sea and on the land—that they should have the right of expatriation and the right of American naturalization. It is enough to say that the last discussions between the two Governments of Great Britain and the United States put that issue at rest forever. The Right of Search has vanished, and is renounced; the right of naturalization is recognized by the most powerful of Christian nations, in every practical sense and intent. And what a happy result it has been for Great Britain as well as for the United States, that the latter have maintained the glorious privilege of independence in protecting immigration, every way, to these sacred shores! I cite the instance upon newspaper authority of the highest respectability, that in the last six years Irish immigrants here have sent back to their poor, distressed, and destitute kindred in unhappy Ireland, the sum of four and a half millions of pounds sterling of relief! How glorious in every Christian sense is this return of good to the Old World, for the past evil to the New!

But though the question has ceased forever, as between Great Britain and the United States, yet the issues of protection to our people arise in various forms throughout the globe. Immigration to us from Germany is opposed in every form. Cases are arising in Prussia, for example, which may call upon us to look further behind the *status* of *citizenship* than we were compelled to do in the case of Koszta. To the casuists who object to the protection afforded to him, I can put a puzzle which I hope may never have to be solved some of these days. Our policy, I repeat, is *immigration*. We have a giant continent to people; and institutions, I contend, which can embrace, and ought to embrace, a world as well as a continent. Prussia throws every obstacle in the way of her citizens emigrating to the United States. As yet her police confines its oppression to her own limits. Notwithstanding the vigilance of her authorities, thousands of her subjects escape in the emigrant ships, and land here safely to enjoy our freedom. As long as she confines her opposition to her own limits, we cannot, by the laws of nations, interpose to promote or to aid or abet the emigration to us. But suppose she should go farther, and send an armed force to sea, there on the highway of nations to arrest and search emigrant ships, and to seize and send back to military service her subjects who had already retired from her jurisdiction? The wail of those longing for liberty comes to us mournfully across the ocean—"*We would emigrate—we, too, would be naturalized—we would that thy country were our country, and thy God our God! but we are seized on the high seas, and we are sent back to native bondage, because simply we were born*

*slaves! The tyrant says—'Once a citizen, always a citizen,' and we shall never change our lot—the burden shall always be upon us!"* Suppose, I say, that this wail should not only come across the ocean, but that it is even heard by an American man-of-war on the high seas—that one of our frigates should witness a seizure and search of an emigrant ship *under any flag except that of Prussia*, (if that itself could be excepted!) What of the case? Shall our commander allow the seizure and the search, and the arrest of emigration to America out of the jurisdiction of Prussia or any other power on earth? No! —by all the laws of Christianity—No!—America *has the right* among nations *to have the escaped oppressed to come to her asylum*, with a free right of way across the high seas; and *once there*, the emigrant shall be safe—safe by the duty we owe ourselves as well as the rest of mankind, to give as much as we can of our free heritage of God's earth to as many of the children of men as will come by our invitation to our homes and our altars! Where is the Ingraham or the Rousseau of our Navy, who would not interpose, and take the responsibility of getting medals or courts martial for his protection to *America's* rights? *And yet here is a case where there is no inchoate right of citizenship.* The truth is, that our national rights multiply with our national responsibilities; that as we magnify in importance, in duties and obligations, we grow too in all the means and necessities of cases to discharge our duties and obligations. The rights are reciprocal with the responsibilities.

I have thus discussed the subject of protection, to show that it has a practical and earnest meaning to us, as a people. The extent of protection which you, gentlemen, seek, comes far short, I mean to say, of what we are bound to extend to ourselves. The pillar of cloud by day, and of fire by night, did not more vividly proclaim Providence to the chosen people of God, than events in our history declare the Christian Deity to us! The Revolution, throughout all its phases and antecedents—its Congress of 1776—its Committees of Safety—its State Legislatures and Resolves—its people and their meetings—its armies and George Washington—its State Papers and Diplomatic Correspondence—its Articles of Confederation—its temptations and trials, and its final triumph!—and then what followed; its fruits of land-laws —of a Constitution—of Washington's Policy of Peace—of a Federal Judiciary—of State Governments—of Western Settlements—of Indian Wars— of the woodman's log wood axe, and of the pioneer's rifle—of common schools —of pulpits and free churches—of steamboats—of railroads—of telegraphs —of printing presses—of laws and learning—of sudden growth and expansion—of public domain from Atlantic to Pacific seas—of prowess in war— of unparalleled conquest—of sudden acquisition of gold—of wealth in production of human clothing and food—of ships of commerce—and all this by a reliance upon civil and moral power alone, and not upon standing armies

and a numerous navy. This, I say, was more than human—it comes alone from God and the Saviour of mankind! If ever any people ought to be—were obliged to be—a Christian people, in order to maintain their liberties, their franchises, their rights, and their strength, we ought to be Christian in our faith, in our hopes, and in our practice. That is all we now need to do—to keep in remembrance our divine origin and our divine end. God is our strength, and He alone is wise enough and strong enough to support a fabric as vast as this country of ours is already. The Christian law is the purest republican law, and every departure from it is weakness, to us especially, as a nation. The stern, unbending Christian virtues best become us as a people in our national, as well as in our individual relations to God and man. We must not become a proud and arrogant and grasping people. Humility and peace are our policy and strength. The true patriots will guard us from the accursed thirst for gold, from the avarice of commerce, from the materialism and rapid rush of the progress of the age. The schools will teach, and the pupils will preach New Testament tenets of an undefiled moral philosophy which came out of Nazareth. Civil engineering, and mathematics, and chemistry, so necessary to develop the giant physical proportions of this promised land of ours, must not be allowed to make new gods and national idols for our worship! And is this our state of fearful, wondrous prosperity, and *we—we* not entitled to be protected in the privileges you so meekly claim for the humblest of mankind throughout God's footstool of earth! *We* not have the rights of conscience—the right of worshipping God—the right of burial according to decent Chrisian rites on that footstool, except in the land we call *our* country, or in that spot we call *our* home! And, if we may send the missionary to the Heathen lands, may we not treat Heathens as pupils of national laws, and if we may persuade *them* to be Christians, may we not much more soberly go to the powers which profess to be civilized and confess Christ, and *ask them to follow His Divine example?* Surely our Government will need no constraint from public sentiment to compel it to administer the very spirit of our civil institutions—that spirit in which they *must* "live, and move, and have their being."

I have, gentlemen, hastily written this reply to your invitation, and it goes to you without being transcribed or properly corrected. It is but a brief of my views, and but an impulse of my feelings on the topics touched. I beg you, if you think it worthy of publication at all, to see that it be printed correctly, and to accept it as the best response which my engagements will permit me to make to your kind and complimentary invitation. I am heartily with you in your plan of American protection, and

Very truly, your fellow-citizen,

HENRY A. WISE.

To Anson G. Phelps, W. W. Stone, Mortimer De Motte, Jno. W. Corson, Committee E. R. Fairchild and R. Baird, Corresponding Secretaries.

## Letter from the Hon. Judge Jessup.

Montrose, January 20th, 1854.

Rev. and Dear Sir,

The invitations to be present at, and address your meeting on the 26th inst. are duly received. That of the 30th ult. reached here during my absence. Upon my return I engaged in the business of our court, and hoped until this afternoon, that I might give a favorable response; but the court continues its sessions through next week, and my professional engagements therein preclude the hope of being with you.

My trust is that your meeting will be accompanied by successful results.

*The boon* we most prize is Liberty of Conscience, and Freedom of Religious worship. No assaults upon *personal liberty* would in this nation be more earnestly resisted than would an attempt to enslave our consciences and destroy our Religious Liberty. No price can measure their value. Oceans of blood have been spilt in their defence, and oceans more would flow freely, if they were invaded. The attempt would find *no friends* in this land. One united feeling would rush to their support.

And it is only *at home* that these inestimable treasures are prized!

Our Government negociates year after year for the regulations of our trade in articles of trifling value.

It sends its navy to protect the commerce and the *persons* of her citizens in every portion of the earth. It looks with jealousy upon every movement which threatens in any degree our just rights. The least indignity offered to the humblest of our citizens in foreign lands is resented, and for it reparation demanded.

We claim an equality in every foreign port for *all* our citizens, with the men of every other land; and yet, we submit in many of them to a total denial of every religious right. We give up all liberty of worship and yield our dearest rights.

The day is past, when as a People we ought quietly to yield these high privileges. Too many of our citizens, seeking wealth and pleasure and riches, are resident in foreign lands, to admit of longer silence. Too great interests rest upon our action, to admit of further delay. The time for action has come, and if it ever be made effectual for our own protection, and for happy influences upon the natives, it must begin with *our* government. No where else on earth is active religious liberty so fully secured, and no government can therefore with such propriety enter upon negotiations, having for their object the entire security of that liberty for her citizens in foreign lands.

I have little doubt of the readiness of the President to engage in this important work. And though I am not unaware of the difficulties which surround the subject, yet I have as little doubt, that decided, firm, honest diplomacy may secure it; and no page so bright would be inscribed in the history of his ad-

ministration, as that which recorded his successful establishment of liberty of conscience, worship, and sepulture for *all* our citizens in *all* the countries with which we have diplomatic relations.

My prayer is that God will greatly prosper your efforts.

Truly yours,

WM. JESSUP.

Rev. E. R. Fairchild, D. D.

---

The following Resolutions were then read by Professor Crosby, of the University of New-York.

*Resolved*, i. That, in the judgment of this meeting, it is the duty of the Government of these United States to protect our fellow citizens residing or traveling in foreign lands, in their rights of conscience and religious worship, as well as their rights of person and of property; and that, wherever it has not been done, these rights should be secured by the solemn compacts of international treaties.

*Resolved*, ii. That, in the opinion of this meeting, it is reasonable that the Government should demand of other nations the acknowledgment of these rights, and the guarantee of the same, inasmuch as the concession of them would only be a reciprocation of what the Constitution of the United States secures to the citizens of every foreign land who visit our shores, whether they be Protestants or Roman Catholics, Christians or Jews.

*Resolved*, iii. That this meeting approves, in the fullest manner, of the efforts of two distinguished Senators at the last Session of Congress; one of whom (General Cass) called the attention of the Government and the Public to this important subject, and the other, (Mr. Underwood, then a member of the Senate from Kentucky,) in behalf of the Committee on Foreign Relations in that body, submitted an admirable report, which closed with the following resolutions:

"*Resolved*, That it would be just and wise, on the part of the Governement of the United States, in future treaties with foreign nations, to secure, if practicable, to our citizens residing abroad, the right of worshiping God, freely and openly, according to the dictates of their own consciences, by providing that 'they shall not be disturbed, molested, or annoyed in any manner, on account of their religious belief, nor in the proper exercise of their peculiar religion, either in their own private houses, or in churches, chapels or other places appointed for public worship; and that they shall be at liberty to build and maintain places of worship in convenient situations, interfering in no way with, but respecting, the religion and customs of the country in which they reside.'

"*Resolved further*, That it would be just and wise in our future treaties with foreign nations, to secure our citizens residing abroad the right to purchase and own burial places, and to bury any of our citizens dying abroad in such places, with those

religious ceremonies and observances deemed appropriate by surviving friends of the deceased."

*Resolved*, iv. That inasmuch as Mr. Underwood's report was not acted upon by the Senate, (from want of time, it is believed,) this meeting would respectfully request the editors of the secular as well as the religious press to publish it, together with the resolutions appended to it, in order that the subject may be more fully brought before the people.

*Resolved*, v. That Congress be, and they are hereby, requested to pass the above-stated resolutions, or others similar in character, as in their wisdom may seem best. And to secure this end, this meeting would respectfully invite their fellow-citizens in all parts of the country to address, without delay, both Houses of that body, by memorial, praying that such action may take place.

*Resolved*, vi. That this meeting, being fully of the opinion that every American citizen who goes to foreign countries to make known the doctrines and blessings of Christianity to his fellow-men—in obedience to the command of the Saviour, "*to preach the Gospel to every creature*"—is as much entitled to the protection of the Government as the merchant who goes abroad for business, or the traveler who goes for pleasure, so long as he contravenes no law of the political governments of those countries.

*Resolved*, vii. That this meeting, holding these views, rejoices in the course which the Government has pursued in interfering with vigor, as it has done, in the case of the Rev. Dr. King, an American Missionary in Greece, and would express the hope that it will not relax its efforts till full justice be done in his behalf.

*Resolved*, viii. That, in the opinion of this meeting, in view of the wonderful changes which are coming over the entire civilized world, by the vast expansion of commerce and the great augmentation of the facilities of travel—bringing the people of all countries, in great numbers, into contact with each other, to an extent wholly unparalleled in the history of the human race—the basis of the Law of Nations should be enlarged, so as to include other subjects besides "*wars, treaties, navigation, and foreign commerce.*" The rights and privileges of foreign residents and travelers ought to become matters of regulation.

*Resolved*, ix. That, in the judgment of this meeting, the time has come when the governments of Christendom, which know the blessings and advantages of religious liberty, should make all proper efforts to secure its recognition and prevalence in all nations—from the conviction that it will greatly advance freedom of intercourse and extension of trade, allay national animosities, remove causes of war, promote the useful arts and sciences, and increase and strengthen the bonds of brotherhood, which the Christian Religion, rightly understood and truly practiced, invariably creates.

*Resolved*, x. That this meeting feels the more impelled to express this conviction from the additional consideration, that it has seen, with great astonishment and grief, the attempts in certain quarters to resuscitate some of the worst and most odious claims which were held in the dark ages—denying the right of the people to religious liberty, justifying persecution, and maintaining the subordination of the Civil to the Ecclesiastical Power; thus seeking to reëstablish a Hierarchical Despotism, beneath which Christendom entire groaned for a thousand years, and from which only a part of it has yet escaped. These sentiments, so repugnant to the spirit of Christianity, and hostile to the best interests of Humanity, the meeting are happy to believe are not held by the enlightened *People* of any land.

*Resolved*, xi. That this meeting is fully aware that, in the prosecution of this important work, the greatest prudence will be requisite. It advocates the use of no means but those of reasonable argument and kind persuasion; but it believes that with perseverance the great end will in time be accomplished; and that it is right and proper that these United States and England should take the lead in this movement, for they enjoy the largest amount of religious liberty, and allow all who come to their shores to partake of it as fully as native-born citizens and subjects. This meeting cannot but believe that the day is near when the world will hear no more (as it has done within a few weeks) of a man's being put to death for changing his religion, or of any one being oppressed and persecuted on religious grounds. Both Christianity and Humanity demand that such a day shall come, and that its coming should be hastened.

*Resolved*, xii. That although this meeting are far from holding the opinion that the infinite God has left it a matter of indifference what man shall believe on the subject of religion, (for He has given us His Word and Spirit to teach and guide us,) yet they deny that he owes accountability in regard to his religious opinions to any man, or any body of men, whether called a Church or a State, but to Him alone who is the Lord of the conscience, and the Judge of all men.

*Resolved*, xiii. And finally, this meeting declares that it equally abhors and stigmatizes persecution and oppression for the sake of religion, whether seen in Protestant or Roman Catholic countries; and it deplores alike the intolerance which still prevails in some Protestant countries in northern Europe, and that which exists in Austria, all Italy excepting the noble kingdom of Sardinia, France, Spain, Mexico and some other Roman Catholic countries. It considers all such intolerance, wherever found, to be disgraceful to Christianity, and revolting to Humanity.

## Speech of David Dudley Field, Esq.

The Resolutions having been read, David Dudley Field, Esq. arose, moved that they be adopted, and delivered an eloquent and able address, of which the following is but an imperfect sketch.

I rise, Mr. Chairman, to second these resolutions. If there was any one idea which, more than others, animated the founders of these States, it was that of Religious Freedom. The Pilgrim Fathers of New-England brought it with them from their persecutions in England, and their exile in Holland, when they sought and found, in the western wilderness, freedom to worship God. The Dutch founders of this City brought it with them from that Fatherland which was a refuge of the persecuted for opinion's sake throughout Europe. In Pennsylvania, William Penn, the head of a persecuted and despised sect, proclaimed religious freedom to every inhabitant of his peaceful commonwealth. The Roman Catholic founders of Maryland, disgusted with the strifes of rival sects in the Old World, proclaimed the equality of all in the New. And in Carolina, to which the Huguenots flew from the fanaticism of their countrymen for religion's sake, there was laid the foundation of universal toleration. This fundamental idea of Religious Freedom was preserved in our fundamental laws. The Constitution of the United States declares that Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; and all the Constitutions of this State, from that which was first made amid the disquietudes and perils of the Revolutionary contest to the last, which was framed in the midst of our abounding prosperity, contained this remarkable declaration—worthy to be held in perpetual remembrance—that the free profession and enjoyment of religious opinion and practice, without discrimination or preference, shall be forever allowed, in this State, to all mankind.

Such being our idea of the right of conscience, it does not comport with our sense of right, nor our self respect, that we should lose those rights when our business, or our pleasure, calls us abroad. If the nations of the world maintained the Japanese policy of excluding foreigners altogether from their shores, there would not be so much cause for complaint; but it is far otherwise. The nations of the world are bound to each other by innumerable ties of brotherhood, of relation, and mutual help, and the observance towards each other of various rules of comity. Nay, more, they acknowledge and proclaim it as a rule of public law, that a citizen going abroad carries with him his nationality—that a temporary absence does not deprive him of a jot or tittle of his national character.

Not only is this the general doctrine of Christendom, but our own country has maintained it with a firmness, and carried it out to an extent of which the history of the world furnishes scarcely a parallel. We hold that

an American citizen going abroad has the palpable and visible shield of his country for ever hanging over him—that he may stand unabashed as an equal even in the presence of princes, and that wherever he is, if he demands protection as an American citizen, he shall have it. This the President has proclaimed from the steps of the Capitol, and our Secretaries have asserted it in State papers. Our Ministers have maintained it at Foreign Courts, and our Commanders, from the sides of our wooden walls, have proclaimed it in language which neither thrones nor scepters can ignore. And even the pride of the ancient House of Hapsburgh has suffered the humiliation of surrendering to force what was demanded of it in the name of American citizenship.

Shall we be less sensitive to our religious rights than to those which are purely political? Is there any reason why we should maintain the one and surrender the other? On the contrary, as the rights of conscience are the chiefest of all rights, they should be the first to be guarded and the last to be surrendered. We ask for no exclusive privileges. We do not seek to make the occasion of our being abroad an opportunity for propagandism. We do not assume to assail the institutions, civil or religious, of any other country, by act or word; but we maintain that an American citizen going abroad, carries with him all his personal rights, and the chiefest among those rights are the rights of conscience with all their incidents. It is true that our country has hitherto done much by treaties; and ever since the time of Franklin we have endeavored to gain all we could for humanity and the rights of man, but still much remains to be done. If one of us travels into Palestine he is sure to meet with insult, and he cannot tread upon the site of the Ancient Temple without incurring the risk of instant death. In Greece, the classic land of freedom, an American missionary has met with persecutions and annoyances for preaching the Gospel in a way not agreeable to the Oriental Church. And I may be permitted to say, Mr. Chairman, (turning to the President,) for I myself am a personal witness, that no person could be more unobtrusive and less offensive to any country than Dr. King, who preaches in his own house to a little band of his own family and a few natives, in the humble character of a sincere Christian. In Rome, the capital of the ancient, and the semi-capital of the modern world, the English Church is thrust without the walls, and the humble American chapel, where our own citizens are permitted to worship, lives by sufferance in an upper chamber, under the protection of the American Legation. And we are told that in Spain, within the last year, the Protestants of England have been denied the ordinary rights of Christian burial. Whether the spirit and dignity of the English people will allow them to submit to indignities like this, in a country which they have saved more than once from utter destruction, I will not undertake to say, though I never will believe it. But sure I am that the dignity and spirit of the American people will never allow them to

submit to the like injustice. We demand not as a boon, but as a right, that American citizens going into other countries, shall have all their personal and religious rights protected—that they shall be allowed public places of worship and burial,—that they shall not be compelled to observances repugnant to their religious convictions, and that they shall be allowed to celebrate those Christian rights which are their best solace in life, and pledge of their hopes hereafter.

---

## Speech of the Rev. Stuart Robinson.

Rev. Stuart Robinson, of Baltimore then came forward and presented the following resolution:

"Resolved, That while we deprecate all political and social violence arising out of the questions of religion at home, and hold to the policy of 'non-intervention' in every reasonable sense of that term, and no 'entangling alliances' with nations abroad; yet, accepting as a practical reality the great organic principle to which our country is committed before the world, in the Bill of Rights, that 'Every man has a natural and inalienable right to worship God according to the dictates of conscience and reason;' and holding this right to be an essential element of American citizenship, we consider it the duty of our Government to press, by every peaceable method, the claim to the exercise of this right for our own citizens in every part of the world; and to refuse to recognise in any form, as a principle controlling the application of international law, the dogma—so absurd, and so utterly in the face of our national first principles—that governments may of right interfere with, and prohibit, the worship of God according to conscience and reason."

I consider it a misfortune that since we began to call public attention to these principles—nay, even so recently as since the report of Mr. Underwood in the United States Senate, a year ago—so very remarkable a revolution has occurred in the popular feeling, that whereas before there was a most singular apathy touching the right of freedom of speech and of religion, and questions relating thereto; now, on the contrary, there prevails a tendency to excess of feeling and popular outbreak so alarming as to fill the more reflecting of the people with concern, and to call forth from our National Senate grave admonition and rebuke. I speak of this as a misfortune to our cause, because it gives the enemies of religious freedom occasion to break the intrinsic force of these great principles on the minds of the unreflecting, by associating them with these unwise and dangerous disorders; for we know that the most successful of all the arts of the enemies of truth is to

mar her attractions for the minds of men by sending her forth clad in the dress of falsehood and delusion.

Now let it be understood that we, as the advocates of freedom of worship, have no responsibility direct, or indirect, for the recent excitement; nay, so far from it, not only do our principles utterly forbid any interference with religious opinions, either by monarch or mob, but our *interest*, as members of various religious communities, is obviously against it. If men will give us credit for no higher ground of action, then our *interest*, I say requires us to demand for Roman Catholics their rights, since everything that restrains their privileges must obviously soon lead to restraining our own. And, sir, more emphatically, as evangelical Christians, must we naturally be averse to the exercise of any authority over religious faith by the multitude, since, according to our creed, touching the natural enmity of the carnal heart against the truth of God, in any case of appeal to the multitude on a question of religion, we know the decision at that tribunal must necessarily be against us.

The true cause of the present popular excitement—a cause more than sufficient to account for it—I apprehend, is the shamelessly un-American doctrines which a whole class of journals have been disseminating—and the corresponding un-American measures which the endorsers and abettors of these journals have been attempting to carry out,—the spirit of virulence and malignity which have characterized the advocacy of those measures; and, perhaps, I may add, the apathy and unconcern manifested in regard to them in many of the quarters towards which the people have been accustomed to look for direction and for the defence of their principles.

As I ever make it a principle to charge no man with opinions without giving him the advantage of his own statement of them—and lest in the excitement of extempore address I may be misunderstood, I ask your indulgence, while I read, by way of foot notes, the proofs of the positions just laid down, as to the true authors and the true causes of the recent excitements. Of the journals to which I allude there are, perhaps, a score—all of them ecclesiastical organs, yet, at the same time, political journals. I cannot cite from all; but what is true of those from which I cite is, in substance, true of all,—not one of them having, yet, so far as I know, protested against, but all of them having endorsed, directly or indirectly, the doctrines which I quote from those cited. I quote more extensively from Brownson's Review—first, because of its superiority in point of talents; secondly, because this journal has the formal endorsement of the whole Roman Catholic Hierarchy—six Archbishops and thirty-three Bishops; thirdly, because his views evidently have much to do with shaping the views of all the others, and are disavowed by none of them; fourthly, because we are expressly told, that, "his conversion is an epoch in the history of the American Church,

and American Catholic Journalism has taken a new tone from him,"—*Shepherd of the Valley, Dec.* 31. 1853; and, lastly, because we are expressly informed by this journal in its own pages, that its editor writes nothing but with the sanction of his Bishop: and in the very last number, the public is informed that in undertaking the work, the editor had "*these principles*" assigned to him to maintain and defend in it. (See Brownson's Review, January, 1854, in article "You go too far.")

I charge these journals with disseminating un-American doctrines. Here is the proof:

1. It is an organic principle of the political creed of our country, declared in the Bill of Rights, "That all power is vested in, and consequently derived from, the people,—that magistrates are their trustees and servants." —*Virginia Bill of Rights.*

But these assert the following directly opposite dogmas. "The Church (in person of the Pope) bears by Divine right, both swords, (temporal and spiritual.) The temporal sovereign holds it (the temporal sword of power) subject to *her order*, to be exercised under her direction."—*Brownson's Review, January*, 1854—*page* 57.

"We believe the direct *temporal authority* of the Pope as Vicar of Jesus Christ on earth."—*Brownson's Review, January*, 1854—*page* 88 *et passim.*

"If the brilliant T. Francis Meagher had been instructed, from his youth up, in the true temporal supremacy of the Church, we should not have now to seem to treat him with inhospitality."—*Brownson's Review, January*, 1854, *page* 106.

"Indeed, we can better endure open, avowed Protestantism itself, than stingy, narrow-minded, frozen-hearted Gallicanism, always trying to split the difference between Peter and Cæsar, God and the Devil."—*Brownson's Review, January*, 1854, *page* 94.

"The notion that religion has nothing to do with politics has betrayed many simple souls into active opposition to the religion of their fathers: it is well that such souls should be unchanged. The Church judges rulers as well as the ruled. The spirit of the age still claims absolute independence for the civil power, substituting the *People* for Kings and Princes. To refute the errors of our times it has been necessary to fall back upon the *strong papal* doctrines of this and the preceding article."—*St. Louis Shepherd of the Valley, July* 16, 1853.

I add one other statement from a communication of "Apostolicus," in the Baltimore Clipper, in Spring of '53, in reply to "Catholicus," of the New-York Tribune, on Brownson's doctrines:

"I say with Brownson, that if the Church should declare *that the Constitution and every existence* of this or any other country should be *extinguished*, it is a solemn audience of God himself, and *every good Catholic would*

*be bound*, under the penalty of the terrible punishment pronounced against the disobedient, *to obey*."

So much for this doctrine of power.

Again: 2. The Bill of Rights declares that "Every individual has a natural and inalienable right to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience and reason."

But by Archbishop Hughes, religious liberty is defined to be "the *right to worship God in the manner God has appointed*"—evidently reserving the right of the Pope, or the State, under the Pope, to determine what that manner is.

"Religious Liberty, in the sense of a liberty possessed by every man to choose his religion, is one of the most wretched delusions ever foisted on this age by the father of all deceit."—*The Rambler*, 1853.

"The Church is of necessity intolerant. Heresy she endures when and where she must; but she hates it, and directs all her energies to its destruction. If Catholics ever gain an immense numerical majority, religious freedom in this country is at an end. So our enemies say. So we believe."—*Shepherd of the Valley*, *November* 23, 1851.

"The liberty of heresy and unbelief is *not* a natural right. * * * All the rights the *sects* have or can have are derived from the State, and rest on expediency. As they have in their character of sects, hostile to the true religion, no rights under the law of nature or the law of God, they are neither wronged nor deprived of liberty if the State refuses to grant them any rights at all."—*Brownson's Review*, *October* '52, *page* 456.

"We found the age clamoring for religious liberty * * maintaining that every man has the natural right to be of what religion he chooses, thus denying the essential distinction between truth and falsehood, virtue and vice. Were we to be silent and suffer manifest error to be imbibed by our Catholic communities? * * We found a very general disposition among the Catholic laity to separate religion from politics, to emancipate politics from the Christian law, to vote God out of the State, and set up the people against the Almighty. Was this, in these revolutionary times, to be passed over in silence, and no effort made to arrest the tide of political atheism?"—*Brownson's Review*, *Jan.* '54, *p.* 101.

Let this suffice. *Ex uno disce omnes*, for those views have met with no word of disapprobation from any journal of that Faith in the country—but on the contrary with approbation and endorsement. Again,

3. The bill of rights declares—"All men are born equally free and independent."

But these writers declare:

"Equality is an idle dream, an empty word—fit only to be inscribed on the blood-red banner of the Atheistical Revolutionist. * *

"The strength and glory of a nation depends not on the vulgar, the commonalty, the servile, or the simple, but on its freemen, its gentlemen, its nobility. It is one of the saddest as well as one of the silliest mistakes of our age, that the few may be safely overlooked, and for all that is great and good and wise and just in the action of the State or of society, reliance must be placed on the many, the *masses* so called. But a nation is great, good and just, only in its freemen, its noblemen; and a great nation without nobles, titled or untitled, is an unheard-of anomaly."—*Brownson's Oration at Mount St. Mary's, Md. June* 30, 1853.

"The sorriest sight to us is a Catholic throwing up his cap and shouting, 'All hail Democracy.'"—*Brownson's Rev. Oct.* '52, *p.* 554–8.

"We think that the 'masses' were never less happy, less respectable and less respected than they have been since the Reformation, and particularly within the last fifty or one hundred years—since Lord Brougham caught the mania of teaching them to read, and communicated the disease to a large proportion of the English nation, of which in spite of all our talk, we are too often the servile imitators."—*Shepherd of the Valley, Oct.* 22, 1853.

But my limited space forbids me to multiply, as I might indefinitely, and from other journals, these specimens. Let it not be supposed, either, that these doctrines are mere theoretical abstractions. On the contrary, they form the life and spirit of the practical politics of these journals and their ecclesiastical endorsers.

The political issues recently raised on the School Question, is a case in point—one that needs little illustration, since it has been forced upon the consideration of the public in a manner to make all familiar with it. A change of ground, and a change of tactics has of late taken place in the opposition to the schools, precisely in accordance with the doctrines just cited. Once the objection was not to the theory of public schools, but merely to having the Bible read in them. Many amiable people, both Protestant and Roman Catholic, were made to believe, that the whole trouble was with the "sectarianism" of the public schools, in permitting the Protestant Bible to be read. But now the difficulty is that the schools are "Godless" and "Atheistical;" that "The education we are laboring to give American children in our common schools is only fitted to make them *infidels, libertines, sharpers and rogues.*"—*Brownson's Oration at St. Mary's, p.* 20.

From the same quarter from which of old came the cry against the schools as sectarian, now comes the declaration that—

"The enemies of religion and society * * seize upon the schools and seek to control the education of the young. To accomplish their purposes *they have only to exclude religion from the schools, under the plea of sectarianism.*"—*Brownson's Oration at St. Mary's, p,* 18 and 19.

And the whole idea of education for the people, even in the sense of teaching them to read, is openly opposed; thus

"We are not the friends of popular education as at present understood. We do not believe that the *masses*, as our modern reformers insultingly call the laboring class, are one wit *more happy*, *more respectable*, or better informed for knowing how to read. * * In view of these and other facts, we, on our own private account, and not as a Catholic, but as a prudent man and as a good citizen, *unhesitatingly declare that we regard the invention* OF PRINTING *as the reverse of a blessing;* and our modern ideas of education as essentially erroneous."—*Shepherd of the Valley*, *Oct.* 22.

Sir, I think we are beginning now to let the light in a little upon the mystery of the popular effervescences which have marked the last year or two; and of the hostility towards Romanism which has manifested itself at the polls, and in popular tumults. When we reflect that our people are "*constitutionally vain*" of their "people's colleges," we cannot be surprised if hostility to the schools on such grounds should stir the blood of the people.

Nor do these theoretic doctrines develope themselves only in opposition to the schools. They enter into the views of these writers on all the political questions of the day, and break out into most violent and unpatriotic hostility to the spirit and measures of the Government—especially its foreign policy. Thus, on the great question of the relations of our country to the world—

"Speaking with an eye to the immediate future, there are but three great Powers of the first order in the world: the United States, Russia, and Austria. The Russian and American are the two great aggressive powers of the age, and they threaten to meet ere long, in China or India, to dispute the empire of the world, and the triumph of either will be the triumph of Heathenism and the oppression of the Church of God. * * * Where, if not in Austria, under God and His Church, the hope of Christian freemen," &c. —*Brownson's Review*, January 54—pp. 31–2.

In every question between our country and any of the papal nations of Europe, these writers are uniformly against their country.

Thus in the recent Koszta case—

"He (Captain Ingraham) mistook his duties, and suffered his zeal to get the better of his judgment. But, as his Government has approved his conduct, we must hold it, and not him, responsible for the insult offered to the Austrian flag. He was probably not initiated into the plot, and was used as a blind tool by the revolutionists. The secret of the whole transaction it is not difficult to divine. It was to get up a war, if possible, with Austria, in accordance with the plans and ardent wishes of Ludwig Kossuth. For this purpose, we doubt not, Koszta returned, or was ordered by Kossuth to return to Turkey, and very possibly with the knowledge and approbation of *our Jacobinical Government.*"—*Brownson's Review*, January 1854—pp. 80–81.

These illustrations of the unpatriotic politics of these writers might be

multiplied indefinitely. I must content myself with this specimen or two, (and they are by no means the most singular,) and refer those disposed to examine, to the columns of any number of any Roman Catholic journal of the last two years.

I have intimated in the third place, sir, that not only have such theories of government, and such practical politics as are calculated to arouse the people been advocated, but also that this advocacy has been in a spirit of virulence and abuse well adapted to inflame the resentment of the people. Nor can I help thinking that such a tone has been assumed with a design to provoke—since they seem to know better. It is amazing to contrast the meek protestations of these editors, and, I may add, of several ecclesiastical pronunciamentos, against all violation of the spirit of peace and love, and all wrangling of the different religious communions against each other, &c., with the practical application of these homilies, as seen in the examples of their authors. I refer here again to a few, by way of specimen:

A meeting in this city, a year ago, remarkable for its dignity and lofty spirit—simply to express the sympathy of American freemen with the sufferings of fellow Christians, imprisoned for conscience's sake abroad—is openly denounced and vilified with every epithet, by the ecclesiastical organ of Archbishop Hughes, and, indeed, vilified by the latter dignitary himself, but in his usual style of inuendo. The Freeman's Journal informed its readers of "the utter scurrility and low vulgar buffoonery, the ribald jest and mockery of Baird and Cox, Murray and Bethune, and others of the same stamp and character." This however, is not surprising, since, in a formal card to the public, this mouth-piece of Archbishop Hughes declares:

"I would consider it equally stultifying to my reason as a man, and abhorrent to my principles as a Christian gentleman, to acknowledge the propriety of using reverent language respecting Protestant clergymen."

See card of J. A. McMaster, in the New-York Courier and Enquirer, March 2, 1853.

But, sir, this rancorous spirit has not been confined, in its manifestations, to "the sympathizing parsons." No public man, however honored, who in any way dared to countenance the principles of freedom, by sympathy with the oppressed, has escaped their abuse. The Mayor of New-York was admonished by the Boston Pilot that "Catholics would remember him" for presiding at that meeting. General Cass, for the sin of making a speech in the Senate in favor of free worship and of rights of conscience for Americans abroad, was kindly commisserated for his "confusion of ideas," and the fear is expressed that "his pleading will be treated as driveling by foreign States," in a public letter from the Archbishop of New-York. The Freeman's Journal boastingly informs the world that if Mr. Hastings, Chaplain at the American Consulate in Rome, makes a single convert, "he will be

kicked out of Rome, though Mr. Cass (Jr.) should bundle up his traps and follow him."

The grave Quarterly of Brownson condescended to declare—"We are glad to see Gen. Cass laid upon the shelf, for we can never support a man who turns radical in his old age."—*Review, Oct.* 1852.

The same tone of bitterness has characterized the language of these writers toward every other public man of the country whose views conflicted with the foregoing principles.

For his famous letter to the Austrian Minister, Brownson says, in the Review:

"Mr. Webster owes his failure to the Hulsemann Letter, and his after-dinner Speech and Toast at the Kossuth banquet. When such a man as Mr. Webster courts the mob, he is sure to fail."—*Review, Oct.* 1852.

Mr. Everett, while Secretary of State, with President Fillmore's approbation, wrote a courteous and dignified note to the Grand Duke of Tuscany, requesting the release of the Madiai. For that mortal sin both were complimented thus by the Freeman's Journal on retiring from office—an occasion on which ordinary political antagonists, however hostile, make it a point to speak in terms of courtesy and respect:

"De Laroche-Heron, to whose pen the Univers owes much, avenges the *cause of common sense against* the Unitarian Ex's. It does not escape the independent judgment of the Univers that the administration *now happily defunct, has been as bigoted as it has been imbecile.* The Univers congratulates the country upon having elected a statesman for President, and for permitting the Unitarian ex-preacher, late Secretary of State, to return to his pulpit to proclaim that Jesus is not God, and Mr. Fillmore himself to become a village lawyer."

When I read, sir, the other day, the speeches of Messrs. Cass and Everett in the Senate, I was forcibly impressed with the thought, that whatever judgment men might form of the correctness of their position, no man could contrast their tone and spirit with the language of these journals without feeling, that *in these remarks of theirs there was more* of the spirit of Him, "who, when he was reviled, reviled not again," than has been manifested in all these officially *religious journals for a whole year together.*

Need I mention the course pursued toward the patriots Meagher and Mitchel for daring to denounce Austrian tyranny? This same spirit of vituperation and abuse has been manifested not only in political matters, but even toward the most ordinary enterprises of philanthropy and humanity. Not only have our foreign Missionaries been vilified, but also the efforts of the humane to relieve the bodily wants of the poor and miserable have not escaped their abuse. Not to cite others of the innumerable cases that might be mentioned, I may refer to the remarkable instance of the philanthropic

Mission in the Five Points in this City. It would hardly have been supposed that religious bigotry would have looked with jealousy on an effort to save wretches so poverty-stricken and degraded. One could almost imagine the devil himself would think it too small a matter to fight about. Yet nothing can exceed in bitterness of calumny and abuse the assaults made upon these humane and benevolent men and women who undertook this labor of love. Mr. Pease, the missionary himself, was assailed in the columns of the ecclesiastical organ of the Archbishop as a swindler and an impostor, and his co-laborers in the Sunday-School vilified as loafers, &c.

And the measures and acts of these men have been not less inflammatory than their language. The question of the public schools has been pertinaciously pressed upon unwilling Legislatures and City Councils, in defiance of the reiterated decision of the popular vote in their favor. The threat has been continually made that no rest should be allowed till the arrogant demands of this party shall have been carried. For a long course of years attempts have been made to put down popular meetings for the discussion of questions relating in any way to Romanism, by the brute force and ruffianism of the unthinking and reckless portion of our foreign population. While renegade lecturers have been applauded for itinerating through the country, blaspheming and reviling not only Protestantism, but the Bill of Rights and the political measures directly founded upon it—any attempt to defend the religious and political faith of the people by a method calculated to reach the masses of the people, has been stigmatized and vilified—and the passions of ruffianism roused to put the attempt down by violence.

Thus, in a most offensive manner have these un-American views been obtruded upon us. Why, sir, not over a month since, in the prevalence of some excitement in one of our cities, as if unwilling to lose any opportunity of obtruding these odious notions and ideas upon the people, a certain ecclesiastic, whose official character no law of ours can recognize, most impertinently sends forth his ecclesiastical proclamation, side by side with that of the Mayor of our greatest city—by way of supplementing the implied failure of the Mayor's power to keep the peace—prescribing to his ecclesiastical subjects the *limits within which* he desired them to behave themselves! And, in reply to the indignant remonstrance of an influential journal against such an un-American style of doing things, the mouth-piece of that ecclesiastical dared boldly, in the midst of the public excitement, to predict the coming of the time when—

"*Trembling Mayors and embarrassed Governors* shall appeal to *Catholic Bishops* to lend them their most active exertions toward *poising on its basis the fabric of our Republic and the hopes of the Constitution.*"—*Freeman's Journal, January* 14, 1854.

Sir, I will venture a step farther, and say that nothing could have been

better *designed*, even if it had been most studiously designed to aggravate the tendency to violence of popular feeling, than the time chosen for the display, the man chosen to make it, and the manner in which the man has made the display of the fact of a foreign ecclesiastical control over and its relation to this country, than that which is connected with the coming into our country of the foreigner who has attracted of late so much attention, to say nothing of the necessary effect of his coming upon the feelings of the foreign portion of our people, who have been driven here by violence (and here I have nothing to say of the charges laid against him by the foreigners) yet the effect upon our own people could not but have been foreseen; coming among them and exercising authority as a judge in a matter purely civil, and affecting rights of property, while at the same time a mystery yet unsolved shrouded his true official status towards our Government, what else could have been expected than that the popular mind would have contemplated him with suspicion; especially under the excitement already raised by the causes already related?

With all the light we now have from the recent call for information upon the Executive, there is still no solution of the mystery. Even were his character determined to be that of a quasi-ambassador, in that case the selection of the man has been particularly unfortunate. When President Polk made the suggestion that our Government would not be displeased at receiving a diplomatic agent from Rome, he had the sagacity to suggest that such agent ought not to be an ecclesiastic. Here, however, we have an ecclesiastic, and perhaps to the foreigners here, the most objectionable of all the ecclesiastics; and he, while yet his true character, whether a public or a private man, is not yet determined by the Government, is assuming (in the popular mind) to play the *judge*, and more than that, to pronounce decisions which are in the face of our national ideas of right. But I am wandering aside from my point.

I refer thus at length to these things simply by way of accounting for the recent unfortunate manifestations of violent feeling toward the abettors of such opinions by the populace. And, sir, I have ventured to add, as probably an additional cause for the present state of feeling among the populace, that these anti-American doctrines and anti-American manifestations of feeling, have been allowed to pass almost without rebuke from men of high position in civil and political influence. The leading political journals of this country have, with a few exceptions, been silent on the subject—many of them breaking silence only to insinuate rebuke of all discussion of these principles. In some cases, even the authority of official position has been trained to put down such discussion.

Now, sir, taking these facts into view, we can no longer wonder at, however much we may regret and disapprove of, the recent tendency to violence

in our country. Our people will not bear patiently everything. No people will. Even the tyrants of the Old World dare not chafe too much the spirit of their slaves.

I stand not here, sir, I will not stand up anywhere, to justify mob-violence. My religion and my politics alike teach me that liberty is law, liberty is order, liberty is reason; "and always with right, reason dwells." But, on the other hand, neither will I consent in silence to allow a false impression to go forth to the world—that our country alone, of all countries, produces mobs without cause, and without provocation. I want both sides of this matter to be looked at. I go for the great Kentucky social organic principle —that as fights *must* happen in this world, in all such cases every man, no matter who, what, or on what side he be, shall have "fair play."

Indeed, I am free to say, that taking all the facts into consideration, the world in this age can hardly furnish a more striking proof of the power of the principle of law and order, under a Democracy, than is found in the fact that so much provocation has been borne so long and so patiently by our people—and especially, in the fact that for such a measure of disorder from such a cause, our statesmen felt free to utter such terms of manly and dignified rebuke in the Senate on Monday.

Sir, I rejoice in that utterance in the Senate. It was worthy the men and the place. It was well-timed, and admirable for what, I presume, was its chief purpose—to vindicate, in the eyes of foreign nations, our country from the imputation of inhospitality to a foreign public person. It is to be regretted that the precise character of that dignitary's visit, and his *status* politically towards our Government is not understood by the people. Had it been so the violence might not have occurred.

I have not sought to vindicate the mob, but to point out the true causes which instigated the mob. Those causes are, I think, obviously, in what I have shown of an effort, for years past persisted in by a certain class of journalists and ecclesiastics, to push Church power at all hazards,—on the one hand to brave the violence of public opinion, in their zeal to put down Protestant views of liberty and religion; on the other, to key up the tone of their own people, to stand by them firmly in the contest—that contest which they seek again to bring on between the doctrines of the Dark Ages and the doctrines of the Nineteenth Century.

I have shown you in detail the manner in which the first of these efforts —to excite the Non-Catholic people is made. I would now show you, in equally clear detail, that the other effort, to infuse a higher tone of bigotry into the minds of our Roman Catholic fellow-citizens, has also been made with zeal. To this point allow me to make a single quotation from a high authority.

"The higher, more consistent, and more practical tone of all journals

calling themselves Catholic in this country, has done much to remedy this evil. Catholic journalists can utter and are even expected to utter truths, the expression of which in their editorial columns ten years ago would have ruined their journals; still our best Catholic periodicals must be content still to do good by halves at the risk of not being permitted to do it at all, if their conductors do not know how to temper zeal with prudence. Many questions must be avoided which deserve and need to be discussed, and if all that is absolutely bad is excluded, much that is very true must be kept back. As no Catholic journalists would have dared ten years ago to condemn many popular theories now scouted by all Catholics deserving the name, so, no doubt, ten more years of progress will have weaned Christians here still further from the milk to which they are attached, and accustomed them to strong meat, which at present they will not suffer any one to present to them."—*Shepherd of the Valley, October* 22, 1853.

I make no remark on this singular announcement—I quote it as exhibiting the fact I have just stated—the effort to "key up" Roman Catholics who otherwise would live in peace as heretofore. Partially this effort is succeeding—but only partially.

They have succeeded better in stirring up the violence of the non-Catholic people than they perhaps desire just yet—for their success in the experiment on their own people has not kept pace with the other. It is at best a delicate and dangerous method of warfare, for if the feeling of bitterness on the one side grows faster than the bigotry of the other, the reaction will be tremendous. This double movement of theirs is not unlike the working of the *chain-shot* theory of our friend Colonel ——, of Kentucky. When the news got to our little town, the Capital of the State, of the great battle of Buena Vista, in which we had two companies of young men—and of course felt intense interest—among the matters of news there was something that gave rise to a dispute, as to the character and use of chain-shot among the groups assembled in front of the printing office. The Colonel happening to pass by, was called in as a military man to settle the question of chain-shot, and being of that school of philosophers who have a reason ready and never confess to ignorance, "Chain-shot," said he, "bless you, nothing more simple. You connect two balls by a chain, say one hundred feet long, then you plant your cannon in range at that distance apart, you ram one ball into this cannon, stretch the chain, and ram the other into the other. Then as you give word of command the two are touched off, then here it goes, you see the chain sweeping a whole regiment. It is simply a grand powder-saving arrangement, gentlemen." "But," said a young countryman who stood by absorbed in the description, "Colonel, what if one cannon didn't go off?" "O true," replied the Colonel, soberly, as if soliloquizing; "*that* I hadn't thought of. Then the ball that went would swing round like a boat fast by

the stern, and play the mischief with our own men!" Much like that unfortunate result, sir, has been this new Romanist policy, which to save powder and do two things at once, has been shooting at once its two guns, the one aimed to stir up the passions by scoffing at all they hold dear, the other to prepare their own people to stand up in a fight against them for the most outrageous pretences of ecclesiastical power.

I have gone somewhat at length into this branch of the resolution, because I deem it important to the success of the principle of "Freedom of Religion," to allow it to stand on its own merits, unembarrassed by excitements from other causes, with which the discussion of this question has no necessary connection. In the language of the resolution, we may consistently deprecate the violence on kindred subjects, while we urge this question on public attention. Come now, sir, to the allusion to "non-intervention" in the other clause of the resolution.

I have not space left, sir, for a separate discussion of the second clause of the resolution, containing the avowal of the doctrine of "non-intervention" and "no entangling alliances." This, however, is the less important, since the opposition to our views arises chiefly from a "confusion of ideas" on the part of such as oppose us, growing out of their failure, in the language of the next clause, "to accept as a practical reality the doctrine of the Bill of Rights" that "every man has a natural and inalienable right to worship God according to the dictates of conscience and reason," &c. I may therefore properly consider the two clauses in connection, in the few words which I have to offer on this point.

It is amazing, sir, to see these vague and indistinct notions current among our countrymen on this great question of rights of conscience. I speak now not merely of such, as with Archbishop Hughes, would unblushingly destroy that article of the Bill of Rights by interpolating a new definition of liberty of worship, as the right to worship God *in the way God has appointed*—leaving the Pope to declare what that way is. Neither do I refer to those who, following the same authority, would make liberty of conscience merely the "liberty to enjoy one's religious opinion undisturbed;"—as though mortal man had ever been silly enough to suppose that human power could reach the thoughts of man's inner soul, and prevent him from "enjoying his opinion." But I find many who, refusing to accept these definitions, yet seem afraid to accept in all its fullness the definition of our "Bill of Rights." They receive the declaration not as true of "*man*," but as true merely of *Americans*. Nay, not even of Americans generally, but of Americans *on our own soil*. For, if they do not formally state the proposition thus, there is yet, as Carlyle would say, an "inarticulate" notion to that effect lurking in their minds, which makes them start back from the doctrine of the Bill of Rights, when roundly asserted, as involving the hor-

rible consequences of "intervention" and of some sort of religious fillibusterism. And under pressure of that fear, and their horror of propagandism, they seem to limit, qualify, and trim down the rights of conscience in religion till the declaration of the Bill of Rights evaporates into the "mere ghost of a departed quantity." One is utterly at a loss to gather the conception of religious liberty which seems to float in the minds of many, who receive the Bill of Rights, and yet deny the right to utter any religious opinions which may be contrary to "police regulations"—who maintain the right, by courtesy of civilization, to visit foreign countries as American citizens, and yet deny the claim of courtesy to exercise the fundamental rights of American citizenship. Under such limits and restrictions, I can see nothing tangible enough even to conceive of. I am in the condition of one who asked a Western professor once, as they were ascending the Ohio, "Pray, sir, will you give me the fundamental idea of this Transcendentalism, of which I hear so much?" Pointing to one of those overhanging clay banks peculiar to the upper Ohio, bored full of holes by the innumerable swallows who burrowed there, the professor replied, "See you that bank full of holes, just ready to topple into the river? Well, now, just try to conceive in your mind the *abstract idea of a hole after the bank has washed away*—that is Transcendentalism." Not unlike that effort sir, to conceive the abstract idea of a hole in the bank, after the bank is washed away, is the effort to grasp the idea of freedom of religion and of worship after divesting it of all right of expression of opinion, of utterance in worship, of *acting* as well as *thinking* our religion. Liberty of opinion without liberty of expression is no liberty. I go farther, sir; I say that true religion, in its very nature, must have its outward expression in speech and action. "*Propagandism*" is its native impulse. The same grace of God that "creates a clean heart and renews a right spirit," impels the soul thus renewed "to teach transgressors His ways, that sinners may be converted to Him." Men seem to forget in this hue and cry against "*propagandism*," "religious *filibusterism*" and "*interference* with police regulations" that Christianity, whether in the individual soul, or in society at large, is by the necessity of its nature "propagandism." It seeks to expand itself—its history from its "beginning at Jerusalem" has been a history of movements for "propagandism" and "annexation."

But I design not to argue this question in its theological aspect. In so far as concerns the movement we are now making, it is purely a political question. In that aspect of it alone the resolution contemplates it, in asserting the obligation of our Government in the matter. We do not hold it to be the duty, or even the *right* of our Government to interfere, for the propagation any more than for the suppression of any form of religion. But it is the duty of our Government—committed as it is before the world to the

great principle of freedom of conscience—as a first principle of our politics, to cause that principle to be respected in the persons of our citizens wherever they go. As I understand it, there are certain rights pertaining to the citizens of every country, which are held by the writers on international law, to go with them in all countries, as "personal qualities." Such, for instance, are those "personal qualities" involved in questions of citizenship, legitimacy, &c. minority, majority—so also marriage, divorce, bankruptcy. As to all these questions, the laws of his own country follow the citizen wherever he goes, and attach to him wherever resident. Now we hold that this right to worship God according to conscience, in like manner, should be recognized as an inherent "personal quality" of American citizenship in all the world. Just as anciently the punishment by scourging was held to be so utterly repugnant to the very conception of Roman freedom, that the orator, when he would inflame passion to the utmost against a public officer, need simply paint that officer as inflicting stripes upon one who cried "I am a Roman citizen," or that an Apostle, when he would palsy with terror the tyrant magistrates, had only to say, "They have beaten us openly, being Romans." So in all lands would we have it known and *felt*, that any constraint upon his religious worship is so utterly repugnant to the very idea of American citizenship, that to say, "I am an American citizen," shall charm bigotry itself into courtesy and kindness.

If I may illustrate by the partial application of another analogy, this right should be claimed as due to the *sovereignty* of American citizens. "The person of a foreign sovereign," says the Law of Nations, "going into the territory of another State is, by the general usage and comity of nations, exempt from the ordinary local jurisdiction." As touching this one inherent and inalienable right, the American citizen, by birth-right a *sovereign*, may be allowed to demand something of the comity of nations; and this the more so since his title to sovereignty is established by the same ordinance, and stands upon precisely the same basis as his title to freedom of worship. If his Government may assert his claim to the one, why not to the other?

We are told, however, that the necessary consequence of such measures on the part of our government will be to bring us into conflict with other nations, who, unlike us, make religion a question of police regulations; and that, too, with the principles of International Law all against us. But you will observe the Resolution looks no further than to "peaceable measures" as the means—and then to two great points as the end. The first, *positive*—the assertion of this claim for our citizens. The second, negative, to wit: the refusal to recognize in any form, as a principle in the application of international law, the doctrine that religious worship is of right a matter to be controlled by civil government. As to the propriety of the means there can be no question. Let us consider then for a moment the jus-

tice and propriety of the ends proposed. Does our government violate any right, or give any just ground of offence to other nations, either by seeking the enjoyment of this right of freedom of worship for our citizens, or by refusing to recognize the opposite dogma as a part of the International Code? I am free to say, sir, that after some examination into the matter, I am unable to discover on what principle of international law other nations could ground a complaint against us. Whether you consult the abstractions of that law as laid down by the text writers, or the practical development of its principles in the history of modern diplomacy, you shall find nothing to prove that our government may not of right set up the claim for our citizens; yea, more than that, *interfere* in the way of remonstrating against the exercise of tyranny over the conscience in other nations, whenever such interference might be deemed expedient.

Turning first to the text writers—who seem not yet to have agreed even upon the true theory of the source and origin of the principles of international law—which ever of those theories we may adopt, the argument is equally cogent in favor of the right claimed in this resolution; for a government committed as ours is to the principles of the Bill of Rights.

For if with one class of writers we hold that international law derives its maxims from the law of nature applied to nations, then plainly the right to worship God according to conscience being held to be a natural and inalienable right, we cannot recognize, at the same time, any law as derived from the light of nature which may interfere with that natural right. On such a theory of international law, therefore, our government is restrained by its own organic principles from recognizing the authority of any law which violates the natural and inalienable rights of man.

If again we hold that this international law derives its maxims from the usage and consent of nations merely, then our country never having been a party to such consent touching the matter of religion as being under governmental control, is in so far under no obligation to recognize the principle, but on the contrary is precluded by our own fundamental law from being a party to such usage—and is therefore free to remonstrate against it. Nor can it be pretended that our country has tacitly consented to such a principle by recognizing in her diplomacy generally the commonly received law of nations—since as touching this one point, she is *incapable of giving such consent*, for such consent could be given only by administrative acts of her rulers; and under the organic law of the country, its rulers were prohibited from consenting to any such principle.

Or if we adopt the theory which seems to have been practically acted upon by modern nations, that defines international law, in the terms of a legal acquaintance of mine—as "the right of any nation to do any thing which other nations cannot restrain her from doing"—then the question is at an

end. For if "might is right," then in what cause shall might more justly exercise its authority than in favor of what it has proclaimed before the world, to be the natural and inalienable "rights of mankind."

And sir, it happens in this case, that even were such a theory acted upon by our Government in this matter—however the world at large might justly reproach us with violating the laws of natural justice, and with good reason —still those Governments of the world most likely to suffer from it, would be most effectually stopped from complaining, by the plea of their own high example. For herein they would but feel the practical application of principles which they themselves have established as International Law through 200 years of diplomacy. With what grace could Europe read us lectures on the iniquity of "intervention" in the face of the history of the wars of Charles V. to limit the power of Spain and Austria?—of the interferences of Austria and Spain for religion in France and Germany?—of the successive revolutions of Europe against the French Empire?—of the Holy Alliance of Russia, Austria, and Prussia, to superintend the interventional affairs of Europe? of the Congress of Verona in 1822 for the overthrow of the Spanish Cortes? In short, of every memorable piece of European diplomacy during the past century? But we are no advocates for such means. I cite those examples only to show, that even should the American government—as I trust it will not—make some high demands in that quarter in favor of more liberty and more conformity to American notions in the internal laws of other governments—even such demand would be no unheard of anomaly.

Allow me to say sir, that even in the past history of our country there have been occurrences which seem now to have passed out of the recollection of some of our fellow-citizens, who are so clamorous to keep down the utterance of American doctrines, in any tone loud enough to be heard across the Atlantic, as if in fear of disturbing the slumbers of despotism. It is no new thing for the United States to make either suggestions of amendments to the Constitution of nations, or of better behaviour to the nations themselves.—We have interpolated a section into the law of nations, declaring the slave-trade to be piracy. We hinted to the Sultan once that his conduct toward Greece was not in accordance with our notions of humanity. We ventured to say a word or two on behalf of South American Republics. Even to hold a Council with them at Panama. Not to mention various other instances, we have recently sent a friendly letter to Japan, expostulating with his Mightiness touching some odd and unreasonable notions of his, which we venture to hint are "behind the times"—and yet these Japanese notions are not much more so than a good many notions about religion now current in Europe, which a similar epistle might as likely modify. Nay, we have recently ventured to "interfere" in a modest way, not merely with "police regulations" but even "Court regulations" in Europe; and to intimate

quietly that their way of doing things in Court circles, not according with our views of the natural and inalienable right of every man to deck his own body, according to taste and reason, we must claim the right to do as we please in that regard. Surely, sir, I see nothing after all this, in the idea of our venturing a suggestion or two to other nations touching the matter of our religion and conscience!

Were it consistent with the proper limits of these remarks, sir, it would give me pleasure to present in some detail the reasons for pressing this matter just now. I shall detain you but a moment longer with a summary of them. In the first place our country now, for the first time in her history, is in a condition to consider in earnest the great question of her relation to other nations. Hitherto we have been absorbed with domestic questions relating to our internal growth and developement. These questions have been at last settled. The bank, the public lands, the tariff, internal improvements, and, finally we hope since the compromise acts, the question of slavery, are almost by-gone parties issues. And as we have begun to grow into importance among the nations, we are now ready for the discussion and settlement of the questions of our relation to other nations. The issues between our parties must now be for a time mainly issues on foreign policy. That question will most probably control, directly or indirectly, the next Presidential election. This then is just the time to present this great issue, and determine how far our influence shall be in favor of these great principles of religious freedom.

In the next place there are urgent reasons for pressing this matter now, arising out of the new relations of the nations of the world to each other. There is an obvious tendency in the present century, from the more intimate intercourse between the nations of Christendom and Pagan and Mohammedan nations, to extend what has been hitherto the international law of Christendom, to all nations alike. The rights of legation have been recognized during this century by Turkey, Persia, Egypt and the Barbary States, China, &c. and perhaps we may shortly add Japan. The inveterate anti-social, anti-commercial prejudices of ages are thrown aside, and the equality and independence of nations acknowledged by all. Nothing is more evident than that the system of international law, heretofore received in Christendom, must be speedily and essentially modified; a new and enlarged code, based upon more enlarged ideas, must obtain. In such a state of affairs, our country, now so great as to command their respect, should surely not be backward to press our principles upon the attention of all nations; and the more so, since these principles alone offer the only sure basis for a law which shall command the obedience of all nations and all religions alike.

And allow me to add in conclusion, sir, that we have every motive for desiring the general recognition of our American doctrine of religious free-

dom that can arise from the desire of self-preservation. From our position and character as the general asylum of humanity, we are ever importing from the countries from which we would obtain this recognition, opinions utterly subversive of our principles. So long as we have railroads to build, this influence must constantly increase; for after all, it is American railroads that, in large part, both build the churches, and furnish the congregations, whose religious ideas have no affinity for the principle of liberty of worship. This influence re-acts upon elements native to our soil, to increase their hostility, as their power increases, to that doctrine of the Bill of Rights. Nothing can be more visionary than the very current idea that here we are to have a milder and modified form of Romanism. The idea is in the face of our great national characteristic. Jonathan does nothing by halves. He will out Herod Herod. "You have no such volcano as that in your country—no Vesuvius!" "No," replied Jonathan, "but we have a Niagara that'll put her fires out in five minutes!" That is the spirit of our people in all things. We will not be surpassed in good or evil. Already the journals at Rome are amazed at the American doctrines of the Pope's supremacy. And with such elements of hostility to our great principles busily at work amongst us, as I have shown in the earlier portions of these remarks, with unbounded freedom to work evil; and more than all, with the constant tendency of the American mind, as all other mind, to lose its hold on *great ideas*, even whilst still holding fast to the words which express them, every reflecting man must perceive the necessity of a constant pressing of these great principles, both at home and abroad, if we desire them to retain their hold on the popular mind. For however our Roman Catholic fellow-citizens may at present hold, with all the ardor of patriotism, to the Bill of Rights—and I doubt not many of them are just as patriotic as the best of us—yet it is not in reason to suppose that they, or any other portion of our people, can long be subjected to the influence of the journalism and the ecclesiasticism I have been describing, constantly growing in power as that influence is, by the immigration of despotic principles, without danger of impairing the force of the American doctrines of religious liberty over their minds.

---

## Speech of Hiram Ketchum, Esq.

Mr. Ketchum next addressed the meeting, and spoke as follows:—

I am sure, fellow-citizens, that you have been very much interested, as I have been, in listening to the remarks of the learned and reverend gentleman who has done us the favor to visit and address us on this occasion. But, if I may be permitted for a single moment to express a dissent from a part of those remarks, it seems to me a matter that may be set more clearly

before the audience. I understood my learned friend to say that the country required some vindication for its treatment of Monsignor Bedini. Now, I desire to state that, in my judgment of the case, Monsignor Bedini has not been ill-treated in this country because he was a Roman Catholic Archbishop. No man, of any religion, will be ill-treated by the Government, or people, because of his religious opinions; but it has been said in defence, I hope untruely, I know nothing on that subject, that this reverend gentleman, Monsignor Bedini, had been guilty of great inhumanity in his own country; and for that, and no other reason, the people of this country, or some of them, thought he was not entitled to our respect. I do not know that any of his legal rights have been invaded; but if the people of this country believe him guilty of inhumanity, who can prevent them, who ought to prevent them from signifying their displeasure, provided no law is violated. The reverend gentleman (Mr. Robinson) will excuse me if I have thought it necessary to say that no man at home or abroad can say that Monsignor Bedini, or any other man, has been ill-treated by any person or people because of his religious opinions; for had he been a Protestant he would have been treated precisely in the same manner if he had come here charged with the same brutal inhumanity.

And now, my fellow citizens, I will proceed to adduce my opinions in relation to this matter. It seems to me that the subject upon which we have met to deliberate to-night is one of immeasurable importance. It is not in my power to exaggerate that importance, and yet it seems to me that I speak of it with respect, when I say that in all questions relating to negotiations between this country and foreign Governments, in the present state of the public mind in this country, and the present state of the world, we are to speak upon the subject with great caution. I entirely concur in the spirit, and for the most part, in the language of the resolutions which have been offered here to-night, and especially in that part of the 11th resolution to which I will now refer. "That this meeting is fully aware that in the prosecution of this important work, the greatest prudence will be requisite. It advocates the use of no means but those of reasonable argument and kind persuasion." There is nothing, my fellow citizens, more natural than for us Americans to think that ours are the best principles for the government of man and the promotion of human happiness; and there is nothing more natural than for us to desire that those principles should be established by every Government for every people; and I may add that there is nothing more natural than for some people to desire that these principles should be established by force against all force, and against every kind of principles that may oppose them. We, as Americans, are bound to protest against this. General Washington, in his farewell address to his countrymen, has these remarks:

"Harmony and a liberal intercourse with all nations are recommended by the policy of humanity and interest, and even our commercial policy should hold an equal and impartial hand, neither seeking nor granting exclusion or preferences, consulting the natural course of things, diffusing and diversifying, by gentle means, the streams of commerce, *but forcing nothing*."

The very basis and foundation of persecution is the principal of "I am right; you are not. I am certainly right; you are certainly wrong; and now for your own good I have a right to compel you to be right." There can be no individual or national objection to the right way; and let us press our cause with kind persuasion and argument, and that is all we need do.

In the first place, we desire that Americans going abroad to foreign nations shall be allowed their own mode of worship—that they shall be allowed their own convictions of duty in respect to religious matters. Well, now, gentlemen, what is the argument? The argument is this: You are permitted the same in our country. We do not ask you to make a treaty that we shall grant the same privileges to your people, because that needs no stipulations. We have proclaimed our principles to the world. We are for religious liberty. We have proclaimed that idea as a part of the very foundations of our Government. There is, therefore, no necessity for us to stipulate these privileges; we can do nothing less than guard this privilege; and we are willing to grant it to the people of all nations in common with us. But we have a right to ask that you will grant these privileges to Americans traveling among you. We do not mean to say that you have no right to govern your own people in your own way, and as you choose; that belongs, by right, to every independent State; but we put the question to you—is it not right, is it not proper, that inasmuch as you have privileges among us, of this high and important character, that you shall extend to our citizens the same. Gentlemen, it seems to me that this is very reasonable. It seems to me that without entering into any entangling alliances, without making any improper concessions, without going beyond anything that is proper and safe for our Government, that we can ask these privileges for our people; and I have no doubt, that if they are asked for, they will be granted, first by one nation, and then by another, and they will find it to be for their interest in doing it; and, if it is properly urged, with kind persuasion, they will feel its necessity and importance.

Well, then, gentlemen, we go further. We desire the influence of our Government to be exercised in favor of religious liberty all over the world, not only for our own citizens, but for the citizens of every country. Well, now, what is our argument upon this subject? Why are not these privileges granted in foreign countries? Why is all of this persecution carried on? There is a reason, and it is this: Religion, they say, is the necessary, conservative principle of State. Men will not restrain their passions; they

will not be governed by principles which are necessary to good citizenship, without religion. That is true. We accede to that. Religion is a great conservative principle of the State. Without religion there can be no liberty. Religion is the great handmaid of American liberty, and it is the conservative principle that is absolutely essential to the preservation of that liberty. There we agree: but then they say that we can never have this religion unless we establish it by law. The first proposition is, that religion is necessary; and the second is, that it must be established by law. Well, now, we reply, that in this last idea you are mistaken. We have tried it. We know from our own experience, that religion can be maintained and preserved without its being established by law. We kindly urge upon you the lessons of our experience. We ask you, for the benefit of mankind, that you will try the experiment as we have done, and see if religion cannot be maintained without the support of the civil arm. We have tried it. We know that He who has enjoined this religion can protect and take care of it, and that He will take care of it. We know that He requires not the sustaining power of the civil arm to support His own religion. We say to you that we have tried this, that we know it, and we press it home upon you as a fact which your experience will demonstrate to be true. But if you come to the conclusion that religion must be established by law—that the majority of the people must have their religion established by legal enactments—then, we ask, for the benefit of humanity, that you will not visit with the penalty those who do not conform to it; that if there is a minority in the State who cannot conscientiously conform to your established religion, we ask you to let them alone, and let them enjoy the convictions of their own consciences, and worship God according to the dictates of their own consciences. They answer that this will never do. If we do not punish non-conformity, we shall lose all the members of the established church. We say, in reply, gentlemen, you are mistaken; for if you punish a man for his religious opinions, so far from these opinions diminishing, they will increase. We know it; we have tried it. Such has been our experience, and we ask you to consider this matter. We ask you not to allow the penalties of the law to light upon men because of their religious opinions. Mark—we ask nothing for men who have no religion. The reason why we ask in favor of the man who has religious opinions, is this: He considers himself bound first to his God, and then to his country, and he could not conscientiously disobey his God, though his country might demand it; but if he believes that there is no God, we ask no favor for him. Let him have the protection of the American citizen wherever he goes; but we ask no favors for his conscience, for he has none. We plead in behalf of the men who come under the obligation that they may serve God first and their country next. We pray you to protect and respect such men; for in our experience in our own country, and in all antecedent history, these are the best men for the country and for the world.

My friends, in my judgment we have no right to go farther. If they do not see the force of our reasoning, we must stop, and not think of the sword or of force, for we have no right to use it. There may be men coming from foreign countries preaching to us that we do not know the doctrines of our Washington—that we have never understood them; but, my friends, they will go out of the country with disgrace. We do understand that our doctrine is non-intervention by force; we will persuade, we will argue, we will invite men to follow our example, but there we stop. The arm of this Government is never to be invoked to promulgate by force our principles, however wise and however good we know them to be. No, my friends, it is not for me to say that these opinions are popular or unpopular, but in my judgment they are right and in accordance with my convictions of duty. And yet here is an ample field, accorded by the spirit of these resolutions, for us to press our argument, to press our persuasion.

Gentlemen, I am sorry to detain you a single moment, because there is a great treat in reserve for you; but there is one other idea that I desire to comment upon this evening. I think it may be inferred from some remarks made by other gentlemen, that we are bound to protect Christian missionaries in foreign lands. To a certain extent—to an extent that is stated in these resolutions, (for they are drawn up with great care,) I accede; that is, that we are bound to protect our missionaries, and to see that they are not punished contrary to the law of the country where they are. But, gentlemen, there is a sense, there is a degree in which this Government cannot protect Christian missionaries. It has been said here to-night, and no sentiment has come to my heart more warmly, that Christianity is aggressive. It is aggressive. It is not content with staying at home. It comes from Him who spake to its first teachers, "Go and teach all nations to receive my Gospel." Go, and if necessary, arraign Governments, and kings, and others. Under their commission our Missionaries must arraign them; but in doing so they do just what the first teachers of Christianity did, they take their lives in their own hands. They ask no protection but from Him who gave them their commission, and if it is necessary that their lives should be sacrificed in order to inculcate and promulgate the truth, their lives are just as cheap as those of the Apostles. They are willing to sacrifice their lives; they ought to be willing to sacrifice them; and you and I, and all of us who are Christian parents, should be willing to send forth our sons, and should be proud of the privilege, to be sacrificed, if needful. In all this they ask no protection from the Government. It may be necessary for them to arraign the laws, and therefore they cannot be protected. It may be necessary to arraign those in authority; and in such case they can hardly be protected by those in authority. Therefore, in my judgment, there is a sense in which it would be unwise, inexpedient, and unjust to call upon this Government to protect Christian missionaries; and yet in the sense in which it is clearly declared in

this resolution to protect them, when they do not violate the laws of the country, we have a right to do so.

---

## Speech of the Rev. Edward N. Kirk.

Mr. Kirk has written out his remarks from memory and brief notes. They are, of course, somewhat varied from the Speech as delivered, but express substantially the same views.

One word more about Bedini. I know from their own testimony that there is in the heart of the people in Roman Catholic countries a deep detestation of their civil and ecclesiastical oppressors. They may remain faithful to their religion; but they have learned to distinguish between two objects which their teachers are always confounding, the Church and the Hierarchy.

Taking Mr. Ketchum's opinion to be correct, that in the recent insult to the Pope's Nuncio there has been no violation of law, it is entirely in accordance with the objects of this meeting, not to vindicate violence, or any insult to the representative of a foreign power, if such he were; but to state the case in its true light. If Mr. Bedini came here as an Ambassador to our Government, or as a Commissioner charged with some particular business, then his person is sacred in the eyes of our people. But, to preserve its sanctity he must really be an Ambassador to our Government; and he must strictly confine himself to the business and sphere of an Ambassador. But if he steps out of that sphere, and attempts to meddle in local questions between the people and their oppressors; if, especially, he lends himself to that un-American and most dangerous project of forcing and coaxing the people to resign all Church property into the hands of the Bishops, then he throws away the Ambassador's shield, and stands among us, simply as a private citizen or traveler. Now, when we remember that the persons who led in these demonstrations of disrespect, are foreigners; that they have once been trodden to the earth by the iron heel of despotism; that they have now breathed the air of freedom, it is not surprising that the presence of a man who comes to represent that very despotism here, should make their blood boil somewhat above its ordinary level. Mr. Bedini has received no insult as a Roman Catholic, but as the representative of hierarchical despotism; the people have said, we want none of your "kith or kin."

Imagine a nest of pirates to have taken possession of an island in the Pacific ocean, at which our whaling and merchant-ships must frequently touch. They attack, rob and murder, as it suits their purpose. Could there be any question whether our Government should negotiate with them by means of an armed force? Take then a real case of another kind—the King

of Japan chooses to shut his people out from the family of nations, and even to treat seamen wrecked upon his shores with cruelty. Here is another occasion of negotiation, at least, semi-belligerent. And the civilized world applauds the measure. But there is another case. Business and recreation are continually taking the citizens of this Republic to countries governed by Roman Catholic Princes. They are not indeed robbed nor murdered by these governments. But they are deprived of rights more dear to us than those of property; the rights of conscience. We are forbidden to erect houses for the worship of God, unless we believe as the Government believes. Thus we are virtually punished as heretics, and we are embarrassed and insulted in the burial of our dead. Our trunks are searched, our conversations with the natives are reported; and we may be imprisoned solely for the crime of talking with a Roman Catholic, or lending him a book expressing our belief.

On this footing we have thus far stood with the Mussulman and the Catholic princes. What then is to be done? An immediate termination must be put to the exciting compromise with their barbarous notions and customs. The only question is, by what means?

One course is this. We may adopt a system of non-intercourse; and thus express to these governments our views of them as too barbarous for civilized nations to meet them on a friendly and equal footing. We may say to these persons—"Your policy is not only unchristian, it is brutal. What right has the God of Heaven ever given to a civil government to inflict civil penalties and disabilities for religious opinions?" If they reply, "it is a necessary police-regulation," we answer "that is just the feature of it we detest; that you tell us you cannot sustain your Government or your Church, without insulting and doing violence to other people. Then you have adopted the policy and the logic of Nero and Diocletian, of Japan and Madagascar; and we, as a civilized and Christian people, can have no further intercourse with you until you yourselves come within the pale of Christian civilization." When we see the cruelties that are practised upon our citizens in Cuba, "insulted and pillaged at the graves of their departed, and that, in the name of Christ's religion; when we see the outraged consciences of the natives of Italy and Austria, hunted, seized, condemned, imprisoned and exiled for not thinking as their rulers think,—we are forced to exclaim to the Governor of Cuba, to the Duke of Tuscany, and the Emperor of Austria, and all the united and robed priesthood behind them, 'you barbarians, you cannibals, we can have nothing to do with you, but to defend ourselves from your ferocity.'" This language undoubtedly must seem to them the climax of extravagance and impudence; but in our soberest judgment, it is precisely the treatment that all forms of religious persecution merit from men who have read the life and precepts of Christ.

But while this course of excommunication would be entirely just toward these princes and prelates, it would be great injustice toward the people they govern, who, generally have no share in these sentiments of their leaders.

A second course then would be, to measure brute force with brute force, and reciprocate their treatment of our citizens. If Tuscany and Austria are right in setting Romanism against Protestantism, as a political system, then it will be right in all Protestants to do the same. And we may therefore begin the work at once here in New-York. We are twenty three million American Protestants. And you say, you have three million Catholics. Now we twenty three million are very much afraid of the contaminating influence of your doctrines and worship. You have always opposed free institutions, and degraded every nation you have governed; we therefore make a "police regulation" that prohibits you from building or owning a house of worship, performing the rites of burial, or using the press to propagate your views; and if you do not regard our prohibition, we twenty three million, will put you three million in prison, or send you to Liberia or kill you. That could be done. But it is not Protestant or Christian, however pleasing the policy may be to the Holy Apostolical Roman Church.

Then there remains the course proposed by this meeting, that of peaceful and courteous, but firm negotiation. We must insist on it as a condition of our respect, and of our maintaining friendly relations with foreign governments, that they put away the policy of persecution, or religious intolerance. It may be said that our Government expressly disavows any interference with religious matters; it was not organized for religious purposes. We reply: that the general government of these United States has not a more legitimate employment of its diplomatic and treaty-making power, than this. It was organized, neither for religion nor commerce; but for the citizens; for the highest good of Christian men. It is a Christian government; a Protestant government. It simply, and most wisely does not pretend to choose any man's religious opinions and connexions for him. To do all that it can do in the defence of rights, is one great design of government; of all rights, the inferior and the superior. We do not ask it to erect colleges, nor to cultivate model farms, nor to plant cotton, or build ships, to erect churches or employ preachers. We simply ask its arm of power to defend us against all unjust impediment or hindrance in our pursuits in each of these departments. We claim its protection at home and abroad; for the mechanic and the scholar, the landsman and the mariner, the merchant and the missionary, the traveler and the foreign resident; for the Roman Catholic and the Jew, the Infidel, the Mormon, or the Presbyterian; against pirates, princes and priests, or whomsoever, that molest them in the exercise of their inalienable rights. There was a time when the humblest man stand-

ing before purple-robed tyranny, and uttering the magic words; "I am a Roman citizen," could make the tyrant tremble on his throne. The time is now come, when the declaration; "I am an American citizen," should be a shield against the tyranny of every land. It may be farther urged, as an objection, that this course is an intermeddling with the domestic policy of other States. But as that would lie against the majority of our negociations, it is not worthy of consideration. If the domestic policy of Great Britain leads her to "impress" our seamen into her service, we must and will intermeddle with it. Or, if she injures our rights as fishermen, we will persistently negotiate until that "domestic policy" is abandoned. But surely our religious rights are as worthy of negotiation as codfish and haddock.

Negociations by Ambassadors is precisely the remedy open to us. We send abroad men conversant with our institutions, laws, customs and sentiments; men zealous for our welfare and the nation's honor; at the same time, gentlemen conversant with the rights of other nations, with international law, and all the proprieties of the most refined society. They stand on a footing of equality with sovereigns, as they represent a nation's sovereignty. They have ample opportunities for calm and free discussion, apart from all popular excitement, or impertinent interference. To such men we are willing to entrust this great interest. And therefore we hope our Executive will always send men of a true spirit; not sycophants and flatterers, not admirers of regal pomp and aristocratic exclusiveness. One such Ambassador as Charles J. McCurdy, (although he had but a part of an Ambassador's power or privilege,) can do more to advance the true interests of our countrymen, to command respect to our political principles and our personal rights, than any compromising, half-royalist, half-Church-and-State diplomatist, whatever his ability may be. I cite him only as one of many men who deserve well of their country, for maintaining the rights of a citizen against "the domestic policy" of an arbitary government, and I cite his example, in the case of Charles Brace, as evidence that we advocate a feasible measure.

Being in Florence at the time of Miss Cunninghame's imprisonment, I heard an English lady exclaim, "I wish she were an American." I immediately inquired why she expressed such a wish, "Oh," she replied, "Your Ambassador would demand her liberation." In fact, that is the common belief through Europe, that the protection of the American Government over its citizens is a reality, and nothing has secured for us profounder respect. Though, I admit, we are losing some honor by our strange tardiness in the case of the Rev. Jonas King.

But if any question this, as the opinion of a clergyman on a point of statesmanship, I will refer them to the admirable letter of John Quincy Adams to Mr. Anderson, in reference to the treaty about to be made in 1823 with the Colombian Government. It is too long to be quoted here, even

that portion in which he expatiates on the point of religious freedom. But it was worthy of the man, and probably conduced greatly to the prosperity which now distinguishes that Republic from others around it, by inducing it to adopt a liberal and enlightened policy.

I would say no more on this occasion, in reference to the defence of our own rights. But I take still higher ground, and maintain that the Government of the United States should use its influence with foreign governments, to put an end to all restraint of religious freedom by civil authority.

Instead of speeches, the worthy Secretaries might have occupied this entire evening with an exhibition of instances of religious persecution in Roman Catholic countries, that would produce emotions of the deepest disgust. Few travellers trouble themselves to see them. But they can be seen by those who choose to mingle with the people. An ingenious writer has said that the Americans judge everything by their own notions. But I should wish to ask him, what other people do differently; or, by what other standard we must judge, than that which we have adopted as the real standard? And we must regard the whole system of coercing and resisting personal religious convictions as a monstrous violation of the natural rights of mankind. They inquire—what is religious freedom? we reply, it is not the right of believing what any corporation, civil or ecclesiastical, dictates to you as the Word of God; but the right to hear Him, just as they hear Him. It is not the right to believe that the self-styled Holy Apostolic Roman Church has all the truth and piety in the world. It is the right of answering, not to man, but to God alone, for your opinions and worship. It is the right of an infidel, or a heretic, to enjoy all the privileges of citizenship, unmolested by anything but the moral disapprobation of his fellow citizens. We believe the whole system of coercing the conscience to be as absurd as it is wicked. Do the damp walls of a dungeon convince a man that a priest can make God out of a wafer; and so that as many thousand Gods are existing as there are priests saying mass at the same moment? If you find a man, does that make him believe the Council of Trent to have been anything better than a shameful political cabal? Did the Duke of Tuscany convert the Madiai by persecution? Nay, did he limit the spread of Protestant views by it? He has only given the more public announcement of their principles, and awakened a sympathy which predisposes men to believe their doctrines. Intelligent men throughout Europe become infidels by observing the violence done to the conscience, through the influence of the priest. The very existence of these laws and regulations is a justification of all other persecutions. And if the mobs in our cities had put Bedini in prison, they would only have done what high authorities have sanctioned in the cases of the Madiai, Guicciardini, Miss Cunninghame, and thousands of others. Some of the best people in the world are now meeting in Florence, in secret, to worship God,

as if they were a band of murderers. Even Martini's translation of the Bible, sanctioned by Roman Catholic authority, cannot be printed without notes. The policy of Tuscany, is, in fact, retreating rapidly toward the barbarism of the dark ages. In 1786 Leopold undertook to reform the Church. Among other improvements he modified a very severe law against professors or preachers, who should say anything derogatory to the Catholic religion. By an exquisite process of torturing, that law was made to condemn the Madiai. But its distortion was so manifest, that they have now made another exactly suited to such cases.

These Governments are warding off an evil day, but preparing a concentration of its evils whenever it shall come. It must come; and when it comes there will be no more mercy for priest or prince. The outraged conscience is now smothering its wrath and waiting its day.

But may our Government interfere in this matter? Without a doubt; not by force, but by persuasion; not by arms, but by negociation. This is not only a right possessed by us, but an obligation imposed upon us. Assuming that our doctrine is true, and the opposite is false, we present both precedents and principles, to maintain the position that our government may and must assume this work. The message of Mr. Monroe,so beautifully commended by Mr. Webster, is a specimen of the manner in which our Government has spoken its sentiments to the crowned heads of Europe in favor of civil freedom. The allied sovereigns were turning their attention to the young Republics of Mexico, Central America, and South America. Mr. Monroe warned them not to stretch their tyrannical arms across the sea, unless they were prepared to sweep away the United States with the other free governments. Mr. Webster says; "It met with the entire concurrence and the hearty approbation of the country. The people saw, and they rejoiced to see, that, on a fit occasion, our weight has been thrown into the right scale, and that, without departing from our duty, we had done something useful, and something effectual, for the cause of civil liberty. One general glow of exultation, one universal feeling of the gratified love of liberty, pervaded all bosoms." Mr. Brougham, he said, declared in the House of Commons, "that no event had ever created greater joy, exultation, and gratitude, among all the free in Europe." The same great statesman remarked in his speech on th Revolution in Greece, before the House of Representatives in 1824, "the time has been when fleets and armies, and subsidies, were the principal re liance even in the best cause. But happily for mankind, a great change has taken place in this respect. Moral causes come into consideration in proportion as the progress of knowledge is advanced." "The allied powers have expressed their opinions, and do not call that expression an interference. For the same reason, any expression which we may make of different principles and different sympathies, is no interference."

These two cases of a declaration of sentiment in the messages of our President, defended by one whose political opinions are, with us, almost oracular, may suffice in the way of precedent. We have, moreover, a right of self-defence in the case; for these tyrannical principles and practices are actually a great hindrance to the free intercourse of civilized nations. And Europe herself will find, that until she shall abolish them, her social system will never be settled again on a tranquil basis. New relations must be established between the altar and the throne before the peace of Europe will be secure; the balance of power will require a new adjustment of these two great sources of power.

But America has a position and a work which even our own people seem but partially to apprehend. There is among us a party who may be named, from their favorite doctrine, the party of Manifest-Destiny.

And are we assembled to-night to echo their sentiments? By no means. Some of them are insincere; for they believe only in Will, not at all in Destiny, Providence or Predestination. Others mean by it; the right to steal their neighbor's land, by virtue of a decree of the Deity, which has been made in their behalf as favorites of heaven, and specially revealed to them.

We accept their terms, and reject their definitions.

Sir, we have a manifest destiny; but it is the destiny to a privilege which we seem not to have understood as a people. Oh that the spirit of Divine Wisdom may enable our countrymen, native and adopted, to conceive its grandeur, to coincide with its beloved aims, and enter upon the accomplishment of the work it assigns us!

I say destiny, because I believe there are two kinds of destiny; one, to a probation of glorious opportunity, which leaves the will free, and with ample scope and every motive to the noblest power of action; the other, to a doom where our will is not consulted nor regarded. The former is the present destiny of this country. I say manifest, for it is patent to some who have read the decree; and may be to all who choose to read it, where it lies, written on every page of our wonderful history.

What then is the original and peculiar work of this Republic? Not commerce: that it shares with others, and is but following a noble lead, even if its tonnage should outnumber theirs. It is not annexation of territory: that is as old as the Nimrods and Alexanders of history.

It is not boasting of our greatness, nor a strife for national glory. We are born too late to be inventors there.

It is not blustering and defying our neighbors. That is too old fashioned for Young America.

It is not confidence in brute force, or the genius of war. That field of originality is exhausted already.

No; the decree we have read, says, the day is past for a new people to

devote themselves to so small and exclusive and selfish an object of national glory. God and man are weary of the bloody farce. He who seeks only to make America rival other nations in wealth, military and naval power, has not seized the true idea of our destiny. We descend from the lofty pedestal where God's own hand has placed us, when in order to determine our greatness, we commence measuring the degree of brute force we have; the number of our square-miles, or the rate of our Steam-ships and yachts. We descend still lower, when we ape the corrupter forms of European civilization, and the barbarian luxury of a mushroom aristocracy, to innoculate this model city of the model republic. It is not our talents, our refinements, our high civilization, that have attracted to us the kind regards and the profound respect of the best men in Europe.

They saw our destiny and thought we saw it. They revered the founders of the Republic, Washington and the old school statesmen, who indulged in no bravado or boastings; who always said to other nations, as we do in social life, respect our rights, and we will respect yours. And they looked on us as on a younger son, who, awakened the hope, by his noble qualities, that he was going to retrieve the lost fortunes of the family. There are now among us some of the noblest spirits that Europe has nurtured. They came here to join us, because they saw that this was the territory where humanity could take on its new phase of fraternity. Here the gospel is unfettered in its action. Here is a national civil freedom, founded on the moral government of God, and the gospel of Jesus Christ. The material and social results of which we boast, are but the fruits of these principles. And the moment we begin to boast of the fruits, we have begun to renounce the principles from which they spring.

We are called to labor for Humanity; for the Race. Patriotism must here receive a new definition, our *E Pluribus Unum* must take on a broader signification. Our "annexation" must change its nature, and enlarge its projects; taking into the national heart the human race. Whatever we may do in Science, in our social and political life let us hear nothing more of Anglo-Saxon,—substituting for it, Human. The field of our work is not America alone, but the world. We are not American, but cosmopolitan. Whatever the savans may decide, let the American creed be "the unity of the human race."

Our destiny then, I repeat, is to hold and to manifest certain great principles, old as creation; new as our republic.

Nothing so fundamentally distinguishes us from the other prominent nations of the world, as the thorough adoption of the principle of man's personality. It was lost in the apostacy, because the balance principle of submission to divine authority was then destroyed. And, to make society possible, the poor substitute of human authority had to be adopted. And what a history it has made for our apostate race! Man, absorbed in the State or

in the Church! Only once, in the long period of four thousand years, did he spring up and breathe the air of personal freedom; in the brief and brilliant period of the Greek democracy.

When Christ came, he laid it at the basis of all his teachings, and interwove it with His Gospel. He drew men apart from the civil government, apart from the established Church; apart from society, schools, sects, parties, families, to deal with them as men. Their duty is personal, and directly to God, with no human medium. They are to call no man father. Their responsibility is to God alone. When this high matter is determined, then the individual man comes back to his country, his church, his family, a freeman, under law to Christ; a law to himself. Society wants no criminal law to defend its interests against him. He has all the law she wants; the law of love in his heart. Human authority checking his outward actions is not the case for this freeman of heaven. God's authority makes him do right toward all men.

This was the doctrine of the Son of God. He gave out the lost idea that man was every thing; and governments, states, churches, priests and pastors, but instruments used for the good of the individual man.

Out of this root of personality has grown religious liberty, and civil liberty. They are but the logical corollaries of the doctrines of personality and personal responsibility. Christ, as a religious teacher and reformer, had neither name, nor badge, nor title, nor commission from Caiaphas or Cæsar. He treated every hearer as a freeman; and taught that the sincerity of worship depends upon personal conviction and the freedom of choice.

That, Sir, is the great, the glorious truth committed to this people: the European idea, on the contrary, is that of authority. European society, and European Christianity is in the swaddling bands of infancy, and the go-cart of childhood.

America's work is, to maintain at home, and spread abroad, Christ's, principle—that man is accountable to God in matters of religion; not to man.

At the close of Mr. Kirk's speech, the Resolutions, which Prof. Crosby had submitted, were unanimously adopted.

The Rev. Dr. Fairchild then presented a resolution which was adopted, "That copies of the Proceedings of the Meeting, together with the Statement read at the opening, be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The meeting then adjourned *without day.*

Thus terminated one of the most important meetings ever held in the city of New York. We cannot but hope that (with God's blessing) it will do much good. It is highly important that similar ones be held at all the influential points in our country.